





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

SIX LECTURES
ON THE
OXFORD MOVEMENT.



SIX LECTURES
ON THE
OXFORD MOVEMENT

AND ITS RESULTS ON THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY

C. T. CRUTTWELL, M.A.,

*Rector of Kibworth, Rural Dean of Gartree II., Hon. Canon of Peterborough, sometime
Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford.*

AUTHOR OF "A LITERARY HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY," ETC.

LONDON:

SKEFFINGTON & SON, PICCADILLY, W.

PUBLISHERS TO H.M. THE QUEEN AND TO H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.

1899.



Preface.

THE present volume was put together in the form of Lectures in connection primarily with the Communicants' Guild of St. Peter's, Leicester, and subsequently with the Branches of the Church Reading Union in Leicester and Northampton, formed at the instance of the Lord Bishop of Peterborough.

A strong desire was expressed that the Lectures should be published, and I have to thank many Church people in the Diocese, and more especially the Venerable J. E. Stocks, Archdeacon of Leicester, and the Rev. F. N. Thicknesse, of All Saints', Northampton, for putting me in a position to comply with this request.

Under these circumstances, I have thought it right to print the Lectures almost exactly as they were delivered. I am aware that there are disadvantages attending this method of setting forth a subject. But, on the other hand, I am not without hopes that what proved interesting in oral delivery may not be thought unworthy of attention in a continuous shape.

I cannot pretend to have brought to light any new facts, nor, indeed, to have travelled in any respect outside the beaten track. What I have endeavoured to do is to place in a clear light, and with all the fairness of which I am capable, the principles which underlay the Movement, the designs of its originators, and the broad results of their

work. In a case where personal characteristics counted for so much, I have tried my hand at sketching the characters of the principal agents, striving to be sympathetic even where I could not agree. If I have obtruded my own opinions somewhat freely, this was difficult to avoid in a series of popular lectures, intended to guide and influence as well as to instruct, and on this ground I hope it will be condoned.

The profound interest attaching to the subject may not unreasonably be held to justify the addition of another contribution to the extensive literature already given to the world. Much of this literature consists of original documents of the highest historical value. My humbler object has been to provide a plain, easily-grasped survey of the great Church Revival, which may help the average Churchman to form a correct judgment on the issues, vast and often perplexing, which it has bequeathed to our religious life.

Contents.

LECTURE I.

ORIGIN OF THE MOVEMENT (1833).

PAGE

Influence of Oxford on the religious life of England. State of religious and political feeling in the Church at the time of the Reform Bill. Attitude of the Government towards the Establishment. Bill for the suppression of ten Irish Bishoprics. Feeling at Oxford. Oriel College and its Fellows. Keble's Assize Sermon. Mr. Sikes, of Guilsborough. Hugh James Rose. The Hadleigh Conference. Beginnings of the Movement. A re-assertion of admitted Church principles, not the introduction of novel ideas. Addresses of Clergy and Laity to the Primate. The Church aroused to a consciousness of its strength. Hopeful signs I

LECTURE II.

PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT IN OXFORD (1833-1841).

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

Newman starts the Tracts. Estimate of Newman's character and genius. His defects as a party leader. Want of early training in Church principles. Adherence of Dr. Pusey to the Movement. His qualifications for leadership. His hostility to Rationalism. Dr. Hampden. Controversy with Dr. Wiseman. Growing suspicions. Froude's Remains. Isaac Williams's Tract on Reserve. Newman's first misgivings. "What is the Church?" 28

LECTURE III.

*SECESSION OF NEWMAN AND COLLAPSE OF THE
MOVEMENT IN OXFORD (1841-1845).*

PAGE

Fundamental positions of Anglicanism, as stated by Newman. The Thirty-nine Articles. Tract 90. Received with widespread indignation. Protest of the four Tutors. Suppression of the Tracts. Attitude of the University Authorities. Condemnation of Dr. Pusey's sermon. The Jerusalem Bishopric. Junior Tractarian School. Pusey on Ritual. Ward's "Ideal of a Christian Church." Condemnation of it and degradation of Ward. Secession of Ward, Oakley, and Newman. Explanation of Newman's position. Close of the Movement in Oxford ... 57

LECTURE IV.

*SPREAD OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES IN THE
COUNTRY AT LARGE.*

Defeat of the Movement in its original home. Triumph of Liberalism in the University. Pusey the acknowledged leader of the party. Three classes of minds chiefly influenced by it. No Bishop at first among them. Gorham controversy. Second secession to Rome. Typical propagators of early Tractarian principles. Dr. Hook. Archdeacon Denison. Butler of Wantage. Bishop Wilberforce. Extraordinary influence of his Episcopate 84

LECTURE V.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

Anglicanism finally placed on a spiritual basis apart from Establishment. Synodical action of the Church. Revival of Convocation. Houses of Laymen Home organization. Diocesan Conferences. Church Congress. Increase of Colonial Churches. American and Colonial Episcopate. The Colenso controversy. The Pan-Anglican Conference. Women's work in the Church. Sisterhoods. Revival of Gothic architecture 112

LECTURE VI.

*INFLUENCE OF THE MOVEMENT ON CEREMONIAL
AND DISCIPLINE.*

PAGE

At first a learned Movement. Methods of popularizing it.
 Preaching. Ceremonial reverence. The rise of Ritualism.
 Causes of its increase. Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.
 Question of the Church Courts. Attitude of the English Church
 Union. The so-called Court of the Archbishops. The practice
 of Confession. The national Protestantism. Summary of results
 of the Movement. Mr. Walsh's "Secret History." The outlook 138

POSTSCRIPT 170

Origin of the Movement.

Lectures on the Oxford Movement.

LECTURE I.

Origin of the Movement.



THE subject of these Lectures will be the history of the Oxford Movement, its guiding principles, and its resulting influence upon the Church of England. It is a subject full of interest at the present time. One may almost say that every Churchman who claims to form an opinion on the great controversy now being carried on, ought to make himself acquainted with its main outlines. I shall endeavour to bring it before you in the spirit of sympathy, but not of partisanship; to do justice to its ideal, without denying its elements of weakness. My object will be attained if some of those who hear me are induced to study its history for themselves, and so to bring to their practical preferences a judgment instructed and disciplined by the impartial evidence of facts.

Before proceeding to the origin of the Movement I am led, in the first place, to make one or two reflections upon the influence in our national life of that famous University from which it takes its name.

From the Middle Ages onward the learning of Oxford has

invariably been made subservient to practical aims. Its object, or, at any rate, its result, has been not so much the advancement of scientific knowledge as the training of public men. Oxford has devoted herself not so much to pure scholarship and pure theology as to making scholars and theologians. She has been pre-eminently a school for Statesmen and Churchmen, and, as such, she has made her mark upon the religious history of the nation. Ideas generated in her lecture-halls have made their way into the arena of public life, and have been tested, not only by their scientific or theological accuracy, but by their power to guide or thwart the dominant religious tendencies of the time.

At least four important religious movements owe their origin to Oxford. The first was that of Wiclif, a genuine popular leader, who carried the profoundest sacred learning of his day from the professor's chair in the University to the parsonage of Lutterworth: and with no higher vantage ground than that of a rural clergyman confronted the serried ranks of a hierarchy armed with position, wealth, and spiritual prestige, and was not worsted in the struggle. To Wiclif we owe the inheritance of the Bible in our native tongue, the most precious gift ever made to England since the faith of Jesus Christ was first planted on our shores. As a political and social reconstructor, as well as a great religious reformer, he will ever be closely associated with mediæval Oxford, whose intellectual restlessness and many-sided activity he so strikingly represents.

The second Movement that issued from Oxford was the systematized Churchmanship of Laud. Laud was, doubtless, inferior to Wiclif in genius and learning, but he possessed great qualities of ecclesiastical statesmanship, to which,

after long disparagement, due recognition has at last been given. As President of St. John's College he began the work of Anglican reconstruction within a limited field. When raised to the See of London, and afterwards of Canterbury, he was able to use his high position for enforcing Church doctrine and discipline by a system of government, which, if based on somewhat narrow and vexatious lines, and often unconstitutionally carried out, was nevertheless strong enough to survive his personal defeat, and to reappear under the great Caroline divines as the guiding principle in the final revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

The third Oxford Movement, though to some of you the term may sound strange in such a connection, was that inaugurated by the Wesleys; yet nothing is more certain than the fact that Wesley's earliest ideal of Christian life was, in the strictest sense of the word, that of a Churchman, and a High Churchman, such as one expects to emanate from Oxford. It was an effort to rise to holiness through a faithful use of the means of grace prescribed by our Church. The lack of sympathy shown by a latitudinarian Episcopate, and the popularity of Whitefield's methods, both combined to divert the missionary zeal of the great Evangelist into channels not recognized by Church authority. Yet there can be no doubt that his sacramental teaching, which has done so much to retain the Wesleyan body within the orthodox Christian confession, was directly due to those Anglican principles which he had learned from his father, and which nourished and matured his own spiritual life in Oxford, and, indeed, long after he had left it.

The fourth Oxford Movement is that which will form the subject of these Lectures. So exclusively is this associated

with Oxford that it has appropriated the name to itself. Whether in praise or condemnation, all alike confess that the great Church revival amid which we live, which is one of the marvels of the Nineteenth Century, is rightly credited to Oxford, rightly affiliated to the Movement.

Oxford University is popularly regarded as the historic home of Toryism and High Churchmanship. Like all widely-spread beliefs, this belief has a strong foundation of truth. The traditions and atmosphere of the place for the last two centuries have undoubtedly leaned strongly that way. And even now, when the dominant influence of the resident authorities tends in another direction, the old associations still exercise immense force. Yet it is worth remarking that both Wiclif and Wesley, widely though they departed from the more obvious tendencies of Oxford teaching, are nevertheless faithful representatives of another, and not less genuine, element in Oxford thought, namely, a strong sympathy with the claims of the individual reason or conscience, which made itself felt in mediæval, and has been still more conspicuous in recent times. Moreover, the modern Oxford Movement, while reverting in its principles to an older form of Churchmanship, and so far rightly called Conservative, has broken away altogether from any political alliance with Toryism. So far as its doctrines react upon the secular sphere, it is rather tending to become radical, and even socialistic in its ideals. I throw out this point by the way, as outside the scope of my proper subject, and therefore not necessary to dwell on. But it contains such important matter for reflection in estimating the larger issues of the Movement that I do not feel justified in altogether passing it by.

We may now proceed to enquire what were the causes

that led to the Movement. The immediate occasion of its taking shape was the danger which threatened the Church in 1833, through the proposal of the Government to suppress ten Irish Bishoprics. For several years past the policy of the State had been antagonistic to the Church. The Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828; the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, passed in 1829, avowedly in concession to threats of revolution, had in succession shaken the confidence of Churchmen in the governing powers. Then came the Reform Bill of 1832, and the predominance of democracy in our constitution. It had become evident that Parliament could no longer be held to represent the laity of the Church. How could an assembly which might contain a majority of Dissenters, Unitarians, and Roman Catholics, be fitly entrusted with Church legislation?

Anxious thoughts had for years filled the minds of many earnest men. It seemed as if the Church was in a state of torpor, conscious of her peril, but utterly unable to rouse her energies to meet it.

On the one side there was the prevailing liberalism, of which the inspiring idea was the secular character of the State, and its indifference or impartiality with regard to all forms of religious belief. Consequently, the Church was regarded by it simply as an Establishment, whose laws, ritual, and doctrines must be interpreted in accordance with the decisions of State jurists. The guiding principle in the relations between Church and State it affirmed to be that of public utility; and no considerations of the spiritual weakening of the Church by what were held to be acts of justice to other bodies were allowed to have any weight.

On the other side there was the great ecclesiastical body, consisting then, as now, of different schools of thought,

which claimed to be the sole legitimate representative of the Church of Christ in England ; but smarting under a sense of wrong, conscious of disunion and weakness, doubtful of its own principles, uncertain whether it still retained the loyalty of the people, and almost afraid to inquire how far the nation as a whole believed its doctrines.

The late Dean of St. Paul's, in his most sympathetic history of the Movement, has sketched with a master's hand the varieties of religious opinion among the clergy during the period preceding the Reform Bill. There were, first of all, the old-fashioned Anglicans, the High and Dry, as they were sarcastically called. These represented the orthodox High Church School, the tradition that had come down through Hooker and Jewel and Laud and Bull. They were, perhaps, the most numerous body ; but their political and ecclesiastical influence was by no means in proportion to their numbers, owing partly to their scanty representation in the high places of the Church, partly to their own declining zeal in the performance of their sacred duties. Confined mostly to the country districts, where they mixed freely in county society and county business, they filled an indispensable place in the national life, but they were out of touch with the deeper religious needs of the people, and confined their ministry to a somewhat barren orthodoxy on the one hand, and a somewhat lifeless routine of practice on the other. There existed, however, among them a far larger proportion than is commonly imagined of men who carried out, in obscure spheres but with genuine loyalty, the ideal of ministerial life presented in the Prayer Book, who read the daily office in Church, visited all their parishioners, and faithfully taught the Church's sacramental system. Such was John Keble, father of that true saint and graceful

Christian poet, who is perhaps the purest embodiment of the Oxford Movement, and whose poetry has given a voice that will last as long as the English language, to the calm and steadfast religious ideal which the Prayer Book inculcates, and which the poet first learned in his father's country parsonage.

But although what are called High Church principles were professed by a majority of the clergy, the weight of influence was decidedly on the side of the Evangelical or Low Church school. They had inherited from Wesley and his disciples, and had developed within the Establishment, the recognition of personal conversion to Christ as the supreme claim of religion upon man's soul. Insisting upon this, they had come to set less store by the outward means of grace, and in many cases disregarded both the letter and spirit of the Prayer Book. But the lofty piety and genuine unworldliness of their noblest representatives had won to their side not only a large proportion of the most active and eloquent preachers, but an important following among the highly-placed laity, whose political influence had secured to the clergy of this school a great preponderance among the more prominent positions in the Church.

This gave them the ear of the educated classes, and an opportunity, had they been equal to it, of coping with the crisis of the time. There were, however, two weak points in their defensive armour, which materially impaired their influence. The first was the decline in their own strictness of life. Formerly they had stood forth as the champions of Christian self-sacrifice and separation from an ungodly world. And this had been the secret of their strength. This had drawn to them the adhesion of earnest statesmen, serious men of business, and devotionally minded women of

high position. But with popularity had come laxity. The claims they made upon professing Christians became less exacting. Fashion brought in compromise. Their eloquent and inspiring appeals no longer corresponded with their lowered and more worldly practice. The inevitable result followed. Their power over the hearts of the people was greatly diminished.

The second weak point was their defective theology, which appealed too much to the emotions and too little to the intellect and imagination. It could rouse the sinner, but it could not so well build up the saint. It needed to be supplemented by a larger system of doctrine, which could rest upon the voice of antiquity, the wisdom of scholarship, and the authority of the Catholic Church. The lack of these requisites was bringing Evangelical theology into discredit, and making it impotent to stem the rushing tide of liberal thought.

Then, lastly, there was a rising school of liberal theology, which represented the tradition of Burnet, Tillotson and Tenison, and which had already produced two names of the highest intellectual eminence, both of them Fellows of Oriel College. I allude to Archbishop Whateley and Dr. Arnold.

Whateley, in the "Letters of an Episcopalian," published in 1826, brought out with great force the conception of the Church as an organized body, introduced into the world by Christ, endowed with definite spiritual powers and with no other, and whether connected with the State or not, having an independent existence and inalienable claims, with its own objects and laws, its own moral standard, spirit, and character. This was a remarkable position for a liberal Churchman to adopt. It seems to have been the result of Whateley's powerful insight into the realities of things. It

does not appear to have had any permanent influence upon his subsequent religious development. It was rather a theory, thrown off, but afterwards abandoned, by a powerful mind in its search for truth. But it had one important result. It aroused in the mind of Newman, then one of his pupils and friends, that conviction of the Church's essential character, which first led him away from the paths of Liberalism.

Dr. Arnold's view was simpler and more practical. He divided the nation into the two sections of Christians and unbelievers. All were Christians who accepted the Divinity of Christ. Church organization and Sacraments were questions of order, not of life and death. He wished to widen the basis of Churchmanship, so as to include within the National Establishment all those, whether Dissenters or Churchmen, who were orthodox in their confession of Christ. This revolutionary proposal met with no response at the time. But it has been revived in our day by a small section of Church Reformers, though it has gained but little hold on the great body of religious people.

There can be no doubt that the prospects of the Church after the Reform Bill were far from reassuring. The Bishops were on the whole Erastian: that is, they acted as though their office was conferred by the State, as administrators of its Ecclesiastical Department. The word Erastian has a bad name in these days. But one should remember that it does not properly imply anything insincere, corrupt, or depraved. All it means is that the religious aspect of public life is viewed as a function of government, and so is brought under the same principles of administration as prevail in secular things. Erastianism is an exaggeration of the rights of the laity, made more emphatic by the selection of politically-minded Bishops. Its great danger lies in ignoring

the spiritual character of the Church's organization, and endeavouring to substitute for her spiritual methods the external agencies of wealth, position, or local influence. It sees that such things are all-powerful in matters of this world, and it fails to see why they should not be sufficient in religious matters also. This habit of mind is far from extinct now. It was rampant sixty years ago. The Bishops in those days associated almost entirely with public men; they were wholly out of touch with the clergy whom they ruled. The Church was full of pluralities, wealthy dignities, and sinecure appointments. Its abuses were many, its seeming weakness great. Its enemies felt encouraged to strike a telling blow.

One cannot wonder at their confidence. A widespread suspicion existed that the Establishment was doomed. After carrying the Reform Bill, Lord Grey had proceeded to call upon the Bishops to set their house in order. Men's minds were in a state of uncertainty, indignation and dread. They fully expected some sweeping measure of Church Reform, which would so cripple the Church's resources as practically to destroy its position. To the surprise of most observers, the attack was made not on the English but on the Irish Establishment. A Bill was brought in for the suppression of ten Irish Bishoprics in order to provide a source of revenue to take the place of the highly unpopular Church-tax (or "cess," as it was called), which it was now determined to abolish. Viewed in the light of modern liberal opinion, this measure can hardly be stigmatized as revolutionary. Unquestionably, the number of Sees in Ireland was out of all proportion to the number of the clergy, and still more of the Protestant population. A determined resistance, however, was made on the part of the entire Irish Episcopate. They

offered to reduce their incomes to a sufficient extent to provide the revenue (about £70,000) affected by the Bill. This offer was rejected. The Bill was proceeded with, and finally carried, against the protest of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but with the consent of the Bishop of London, and, naturally, to the great satisfaction of Irish Roman Catholics and English Liberals (1833).

It was during the conflict of opinion produced by this Bill that John Keble was appointed to preach the Assize Sermon in the University Pulpit. To this sermon the man who of all others was best able to judge,¹ always attributed the origin of the Oxford Movement.

It is necessary, therefore, to pause for a moment, and say a few words about Keble, his genius, his Churchmanship, and his influence.

And to do this in an intelligible manner it will be advisable to go back a little, and describe the institution which did so much to mould the minds of great men, and which for many years was identified with all that was in Oxford most intellectually progressive, and in Churchmanship most learned and devout.

Oriel College is one of the smaller Colleges in the University, and by no means one of the wealthiest. It gained its pre-eminence through the skilful administration of its Head or Provost, Dr. Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff. This gentleman is one of the best examples of the old-fashioned Head of a College. An able administrator, decidedly autocratic, but devoted to the welfare of the institution over which he presided, he identified himself with the policy, then first coming into vogue, of raising the position of his College by throwing its fellowships open to competi-

¹ J. H. Newman, in his *Apologia*.

tion from members of the other Colleges, and refusing to elect as fellow any candidate who failed to come up to a very high standard, either of learning or of intellectual originality. A simple device, but pre-eminently successful. Early in the century Oriel already boasted of being the most intellectual College in the University. The Common Room, *i.e.*, the society of fellows which met every evening for dinner and conversation, became renowned for the brilliancy of its talk, the daring originality of the ideas circulated, and the unsparing criticism to which every established custom and doctrine, whether secular or religious, was subjected. Men's powers of reasoning, already trained by the severest methods of logic, were developed by the still severer process of open discussion, in which every argument was sifted, without fear or favour, and no conclusion was allowed to pass that could not stand the ordeal of acute and merciless cross-examination.

Such an atmosphere was not favourable to the spirit of reverence, nor to acquiescence in opinions which, however valuable, had been inherited, not reasoned out. Mr. T. Mozley has remarked that to one class of minds truth is valued as a possession, something which we already have, and which only needs to be carefully understood, clearly enunciated, and drawn out by inference to its various applications and conclusions. To another class of minds truth is something that has to be obtained by search: its value is not so much in the fact that we possess it as in the discipline that we have gone through in attaining it; and every age and every individual, if they are to rise to truth that is worthy of the name, must go through this process, and win their way to sure conviction.

The former class of mind is conservative or orthodox; the latter innovating or sceptical. Now both types of mind were

found in the Oriel Common Room. But inasmuch as the Christian system was accepted as a first principle by all, the differences lay rather in their method of arguing from it than in their attitude towards its fixed dogmas.

In 1811 two men were admitted to the Society in whom respectively these two tendencies found their highest embodiment. The one was Whateley, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, the other was Keble. Whateley was the ablest logical reasoner in all that able company. His boldness of ideas equalled his exactness of argument. Confident in himself, awed neither by age nor reputation, claiming for himself an ascendancy justified by his powers, he rose almost at once to the first place.

Keble was a complete contrast to Whateley. While a mere boy he had gained the highest honours that the University had to bestow, and at the age of nineteen found himself elected to a fellowship, already, so far as Academical distinctions went, the most notable young man in the University. But his temperament was not in accordance with these brilliant gifts. He was by nature shy and retiring, without push or ambition to shine. He was unwilling to argue for argument's sake. He was wholly wrapped up in the solemn responsibilities of the ministerial life, for which he had already begun to prepare. He took Holy Orders in 1815, and for the next two years resided mainly out of Oxford, though retaining his rooms in College. In 1817 he was recalled to residence as College Tutor, an office which he held for six years. During these years of quiet, unobtrusive work, he obtained a great and lasting influence, not only over his pupils, who loved him with rare affection, but also over the brilliant society of the Common Room, which fully appreciated his intellectual gifts, and revered his purity of

Christian example. While Keble was Tutor, three men were elected to Fellowships who have left their mark for ever upon the English nation and Church. The first was Thomas Arnold, founder of the modern Public School. The two others were John Henry Newman and Edward Bouverie Pusey. To Arnold himself we shall not have occasion to refer again, though indirectly he was concerned with several passages in the history of the Movement. His own mind was radically antagonistic to its principles, and being incapable of entering into the views of its authors, he became not only the severest, but the most unfair of all their critics. Nevertheless, the fact that for a short period he enjoyed their friendship, makes a brief reference to him appropriate. The work he did for religion was on lines as opposite to theirs as it is possible to conceive. But it is the glory and privilege of the Church of England to be so much broader in her comprehensiveness than the particular grasp of truth which even the most gifted of her children can attain, that we can thank God equally for the moral enthusiasm and spiritual simplicity of the one, and for the saintly purity and intellectual constructiveness of the others. We can rank them as alike loyal members of the English Church. We can claim them as alike true to her Spirit. We can and do believe that in spite of the divergence of the aims for which they strove on earth, there is a higher sphere of being, in which these seeming opposites are reconciled, and in which souls, who have striven according to their light, are able to appreciate each other's faithfulness, and to discern clearly, what here we can but dimly imagine, the vast manysidedness of truth.

Of Newman and Pusey I shall speak in my next lecture. I now return to the part taken by Keble.

Even among his academic duties Keble's heart was in pastoral life. Already, in 1819, he had thought of leaving Oxford, but was persuaded to remain. In 1823 his mother died. The solitude of his father, whom he loved with the warmth of a most affectionate nature, decided him to resign his Tutorship, and accept a curacy in Gloucestershire, near his father's living. Fairford was a rustic village, yet not so distant from Oxford as to prevent frequent visits from his friends. Some of his Oriel pupils read with him during the vacations, and a few select men from other Colleges.

Among those who were thus admitted to his intimate intercourse were three young men of promise, all of whom made their mark in the Church, Robert Wilberforce, Isaac Williams and Richard Hurrell Froude. It was natural that Keble's influence should produce a profound effect upon these men. It was hardly to be expected that one of them should scarcely less profoundly influence Keble. Yet so it was. The character of Froude was one of great originality and of the rarest gifts. An aristocrat both in birth and intellect, of brilliant imagination, strong powers of reasoning and the utmost boldness of mind, he was at once captivated and subdued by the simple sweetness of Keble's religion, and throwing himself with unreserved trust upon his master's confidence, he laid open to him all the questionings of his intellect, all the tempest of his hopes and fears.

As I have said, Keble's own temper was that of a poet, contemplative, reverent, joyous, unargumentative. But to Froude argument was everything. Flashes of wit, bordering on irreverence, roused Keble to gentle reproof, all the more penetrating from its loving humility. By constant searching for the grounds of rational faith in the company of these able companions, Keble was led to investigate more deeply his

own ecclesiastical principles. Brought up in the teaching of the Prayer Book, imbued with the conviction of the perfection of its sober standard of piety, which he has brought home to every Churchman's heart in his exquisite Christian Year, he distrusted the sentimental Evangelicalism of his day, while he positively loathed the cold utilitarian school of theology which made the Church little more than the guardian of the nation's morals. In the words of the writer I have already referred to, he declared that "it neglected the feelings as Evangelicalism neglected the character, and his mind craved for a religion which should affect the whole man, and keep both feelings and intellect under the control of the will. To enforce this he fell back upon the conception of the Church which he had inherited from his father, as a body independent of the State, founded by the Lord Himself, perpetuated by direct succession from the Apostles, one in continuous history and doctrine with the Primitive Church, filled with a supernatural and sacramental life, witnessing to a high moral standard before the world. This conception of the Church laid hold of his pupils, and through them passed into a power at Oxford. To make that conception a reality he devoted his entire life with a chivalry that nothing could daunt; for that he sent forth his pupils as a band of missionaries." Both Froude and Williams, on their return to Oxford a year or two later,¹ looked to Keble as the friend, guide and counsellor of their lives.

It is true no immediate result was produced. But the Oxford Movement was prepared. The train was laid; in due course the moment came for firing it, and the hand was not wanting that should apply the light.

Meanwhile there were influences outside Oxford making

¹ Froude was appointed Tutor of Oriel in 1826.

towards the same end. The truth of the old proverb, "Man's extremity is God's opportunity," was again to be made good. In various parts of England a spirit of zeal for the Church was beginning to arise. A conviction was struggling into shape that the force needed to cope with the situation was belief in that long neglected article of the Creed, "the Holy Catholic Church." There is a very remarkable record of a letter or conversation, it is not quite certain which, emanating from Mr. Sikes, Rector of Guilsborough in Northamptonshire, which is almost of prophetic import. The document is so extremely interesting that I shall make no apology for bringing it before you. Mr. Sikes was one of the old-fashioned school of Churchmen, of the type of the elder Keble. These are his words (1833): "I seem to think I can tell you something which you who are young may probably live to see, but which I, who shall soon be called away off the stage, shall not. Wherever I go, all about the country, I see amongst the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching, the universal suppression of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere, as far as I can see, of the One Holy Catholic Church. I think that the causes of this suppression have been mainly two. The Church has been kept out of sight partly in consequence of the civil establishment of the branch of it which is in this country, and partly out of a false charity to Dissent. Now this great truth is an article of the Creed; and if so, to teach the rest of the Creed to its exclusion must be to destroy the proportion of the Faith. This cannot be done without the most serious consequences. The doctrine is of the last importance, and the principles it involves of

immense power ; and some day, not far distant, it will judicially have its reprisals. And whereas the other articles of the Creed seem now to have thrown it into the shade, it will seem, when it is brought forward, to swallow up all the rest. We now hear not a breath about the Church. By-and-bye, those who live to see it will hear of nothing else ; and just in proportion, perhaps, to its present suppression will be its future development. Our confusion nowadays is chiefly owing to the want of it ; and there will be yet more confusion attending its revival. The effects of it I even dread to contemplate, especially if it come suddenly. And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward. It ought especially of all others to be matter of catechetical teaching and training. The doctrine of the Catholic Church and its privileges cannot be explained from pulpits, and those who have to explain it will hardly know where they are or which way they are to turn themselves. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of Popery from one end of the country to the other. It will be thrust upon minds unprepared. Some will take it up as a beautiful theory unrealized ; others will be frightened and scandalized, and reject it ; and all will want a guidance which one hardly knows where they will find. How the doctrine will be first thrown forward we know not, but the powers of the world may any day turn their backs upon us, and these will lead to the effects I have described."¹

Never were words uttered more full of prophetic truth. They were fulfilled to the very letter, and in the very year in

¹ " From a conversation with Rev. W. J. Copeland, preserved in Mr. Copeland's handwriting in his copy of Sikes' *Parochial Communion*." (Lock's Keble, p. 76.)

which he uttered them the fulfilment began. Hugh James Rose, a wealthy clergyman and brilliant Cambridge scholar, held for some years the post of Christian Advocate in that University. In 1832 he started a Church paper called the *British Magazine*, for the express purpose of advocating Catholic principles. Joshua Watson, the Secretary of the Christian Knowledge Society in London, united cordially with him as a layman for the same object. These two Churchmen had publicly expressed their conviction that something must be done, and done immediately, if the Church life of England was not to be irreparably injured (1833). At this very moment Keble was called upon to preach the Assize Sermon at Oxford, to which I have already alluded. The occasion was in many ways notable. The sermon was held in the Summer Term, when not only His Majesty's Judges of Assize, and their retinue, but many distinguished visitors from the political and social leaders of London were in Oxford. Religious feeling was deeply stirred. The whole University came as one man to hear the preacher. Never was a great opportunity more greatly used. The sermon was listened to with marked attention, and immediately published under the significant title of National Apostasy. The gentle spirit of the poet was kindled into terrible indignation. He declared that the action of the Government was at bottom nothing less than a treason to the Christian religion, and an abandonment of the Church's faith. His appeal went straight home to the hearts of men whom a Divine impulse had touched.

A meeting was immediately arranged to be held at Hadleigh Rectory, in Essex, where Hugh James Rose lived, to consult on the steps to be taken. There the celebrated gathering took place, from July 25th to 29th, which was the actual

beginning of the Movement. Keble and Newman were unable to attend, but they wrote signifying their agreement with its object. Four friends of the Church met together, and for four days discussed the situation. They were Mr. Rose, Mr. Perceval (a friend and pupil of Keble's), Mr. Froude, and Mr. Palmer, an Irish Churchman, who had migrated to Oxford, and had gained considerable credit by his learned work on the origin of the Prayer Book entitled *Origines Liturgicæ*.

The Conference broke up without arranging any definite plan, but all pledged themselves to take some action. Mr. Rose was of opinion that Associations of Churchmen, somewhat similar in character to the English Church Union of later days, would be the best method of leavening public opinion. Mr. Palmer agreed with this, and was further of opinion that addresses to the King and the Archbishop of Canterbury should be signed, declaring the fixed loyalty of Churchmen to the principles of the Church. Froude believed that popular tracts, or leaflets, would be more efficacious, and all were of opinion that this method should be tried, as well as that recommended by Mr. Palmer.

Mr. Palmer and Mr. Froude then returned to Oxford, and carried on their deliberations with the residents there, among whom Mr. Newman had now emerged as the leading spirit. Newman had been brought into communication with Keble some five years before this through the instrumentality of Froude, and the acquaintance then begun had gradually ripened into a most intimate friendship, in which the mind of the younger man received and assimilated the Church ideas of the elder. A spirit so bold and original as Newman's can hardly be spoken of as indebted for its conclusions to any single master. And yet there can be no doubt that Keble's

influence on Newman was profound and lasting. Only, as I shall try to explain in my second lecture, Newman's early training in religion had been so radically different from Keble's, and his convictions had been formed by processes so diverse, that the development of the one was almost bound to run a different course from that of the other. Newman received Keble's ideas first through the medium of Charles Hurrell Froude, whose impetuous and logical mind was more congenial to him than the calmer and more imaginative spirit of Keble.¹ Nevertheless, we are justified in asserting that Newman, no less than Froude and Isaac Williams, may truly be spoken of as Keble's disciples.

A word must be said about the two men to whom I have just alluded, William Palmer and Isaac Williams. The former, as I mentioned, was a man of deep learning, and of firmly held but by no means extreme Church views. He represented with Rose and Perceval what one may call the conservative element in the Movement. Isaac Williams is a remarkable and very beautiful type of character. A refined scholar, with a true vein of tender poetry, delicately organized both in body and mind, he owed (as he himself tells us) his whole religious life under God to Keble; and when he returned to Oxford as Tutor, he made it his chief effort to spread Keble's influence and propagate his ideas. His saintly purity at once gained the admiring love of Newman, who made him his curate at St. Mary's, Oxford,² and admitted

¹ One of Froude's remarks was that he had done *one* good thing in his life in bringing Newman and Keble to understand one another.

² The Parish Church of St. Mary's, notable for the exquisite beauty of its spire, is used twice every Sunday for the preaching of the University Sermon. It therefore possesses an academical as well as a parochial character, and indeed the latter aspect is quite overshadowed by the former. And its incumbents have generally been men eminent for their learning, spiritual influence, or high standing in the University.

him to the closest friendship. And all through this critical time we find him at Newman's side, taking a modest but very influential part in all discussions, and balancing to some extent the more aggressive influence of Froude.

One point, however, must be insisted on most strongly in connection with the first launching of the Movement. Every one of those concerned in it was firmly resolved to teach nothing new. Their first and foremost object was to bring to light old but forgotten truths. Never for a moment did Keble, Newman, or even Froude design to introduce any doctrine except those which had been proved to be taught by the Church of England in her authorized formularies, interpreted by her most orthodox divines, and enunciated long ago by those early Fathers, to whom our Church again and again refers her members as the truest exponents of the faith originally received.

This is clearly shown in the two forms of address which were drawn up and presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury. As these addresses were the first united action taken by the founders of the Movement, and were unanimously approved by the whole number, I think it worth while to transcribe them. They will serve to show what the original principles of the Oxford Churchmen were, and how truly they expressed the feelings of an immense majority both of the clergy and laity of England. The first was signed by Clergy only, and was as follows :

“To the Most Rev. Father in God, William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England.

“We, the undersigned Clergy of England and Wales, are desirous of approaching your Grace with the expression of our veneration for the sacred office, to which, by Divine

Providence, you have been called, of our respect and affection for your personal character and virtues, and of our gratitude for the firmness and discretion which you have evinced in a season of peculiar difficulty and danger.

“At a time when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments, and the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the Apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are Ministers; and our deep-rooted attachment to that venerable Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the Orthodox and Primitive Faith.

“And while we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not less solicitous to declare our firm conviction that should anything, from the lapse of years or altered circumstances, require renewal or correction, your Grace and our other spiritual rulers may rely upon the cheerful co-operation and dutiful support of the clergy in carrying into effect any measures that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connection between Bishops, clergy, and people, and to promote the purity, efficiency, and unity of the Church.”

Early in February, 1834, this document, with the signatures of 7,000 clergy, was presented to Archbishop Howley at Lambeth, by a deputation consisting of members of the Lower House of Convocation, including many Deans, Archdeacons, Proctors of Chapters and Diocesan Clergy, Professors and Heads of Houses from Oxford and Cambridge.

An address to the Archbishop from the laity of England,

drawn up by a layman, and signed by 230,000 heads of families, was also presented, which embodies the grounds of attachment to the Church which then, as now, held the laity to their allegiance, and should be most carefully weighed by all those with whom rests the direction of the Church's present policy. It is as follows :—

“ At a time when the clergy of England and Wales have felt it their duty to address their Primate with an expression of unshaken adherence to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of which they are ministers, we, the undersigned, as lay members of the same, are not less anxious to record our firm attachment to her pure faith and worship, and her Apostolic form of government.

“ We further find ourselves called upon, by the events which are daily passing around us, to declare our firm conviction that the consecration of the State by the public maintenance of the Christian Religion is the first and paramount duty of a Christian people; and that the Church Established in these realms, by carrying its sacred and beneficial influences through all orders and degrees, and into every corner of the land, has for many ages been the great and distinguishing blessing of this country, and not less the means, under Divine Providence, of national prosperity than of individual piety.

“ In the preservation, therefore, of this our National Church in the integrity of her rights and privileges, and in her alliance with the State, we feel that we have an interest no less real, and no less direct, than her immediate ministers; and we accordingly avow our firm determination to do all that in us lies, in our several stations, to uphold unimpaired in its security and efficiency, that Establishment which we have received as the richest legacy of our forefathers, and

desire to hand down as the best inheritance of our posterity."

In addition to these steps associations of Churchmen were started in various cities and towns, which proved the attachment to the Church's system to be more widespread than was believed.

In fact, the extremity of the danger aroused all that latent enthusiasm for the Church which, because it slumbers or fails to speak, is so often supposed to have died out. "At that time it appeared as if revolutionary principles in religion were all but universal. Scarcely a voice of any authority was uplifted on behalf of truth, or if uplifted it was unheard." The entire press was in favour of liberalism in religion; so were the leaders of public opinion, the fashionable prophets of the age. But in the address drawn up by Palmer, and corrected by Newman, a pledge was given to the world that the vast majority of the clergy, and no inconsiderable body of lay-people, were determined to maintain the principles and essential discipline of the Church as against the spirit of revolutionary change then current.

"The Church at once rose from her deep depression, and found to her astonishment that the nation was nearly unanimous in devotion to the old and established faith and worship; that it was of the same Creed which had for three centuries placed England at the head of the reformed and believing Christianity of the world."

It is worthy of remark that the Movement originated not among the Bishops or any dignitaries of the Church, but among a few priests little known beyond the bounds of Oxford. As in the cases of Wiclif, Wesley and Whitefield, it was the inferior clergy that met the attacks on faith, organized resistance, and woke the nation's conscience. The higher clergy are always hampered by the position of the Establish-

ment, and the constant timidity and caution which the situation requires. In those days a far larger proportion of them than at present were out of touch with the rank and file of the priesthood. Bishops were appointed, as a rule, from considerations either of family or political support or classical scholarship, comparatively seldom because they had successfully worked for the salvation of souls. The high social consideration of a Bishop in those days kept him at an almost impassable distance from his clergy. His associates were county magnates, judges and politicians, and, except the favoured circle whom he took into his immediate surroundings, few of the clergy had much chance of opening their minds to him. As to the common people of the Diocese, they saw little of their Bishop. An occasional Confirmation, attended with much pomp and ceremony, brought home to their minds the fact that the Church was episcopally governed. But if the popularity of the Establishment had depended upon the Bishops, the blow so widely dreaded would have fallen long ago. This was the reason why almost all the prominent Statesmen of the day miscalculated the real feeling of the people. They could see their indifference to the Church authorities, frequently betokening something stronger than indifference. But they could not see the quiet pervading influence in every parish of clergy who, whatever their faults, were in true sympathy and touch with their parishioners.

Thus the influence that saved the Establishment and re-awakened the spiritual power of the Church of England was that of the parish clergy. Keble and Newman and their friends did not create a Church enthusiasm. It was already there, but timid and voiceless, until they gave it form. As Newman truly says, "The Movement was in the air." The

clergy saw clearly, and thousands of the laity saw almost as clearly, that liberalism in theology meant destruction of the faith. And when the Oxford School boldly predicted this result, and set themselves to avert it, a vast spiritual impulse stirred the length and breadth of the land, and the Church roused herself and knew her strength.

In these days of hard-working, pious and devoted Bishops, chosen almost always for their Christian character and power over men, we can hardly realize the chasm that then parted the two orders of the ministry. This is indeed one of the direct results of the Movement, and one that we may feel confident will be maintained. Whatever the clergy may be in the future, it is certain that those who are appointed to rule over them will be the best and strongest of their number. It is no doubt the fashion in some quarters to criticize the Episcopate as wanting in firmness and afraid to speak out. I myself doubt altogether the justice of this charge. I believe that our Bench of Bishops represents, as nearly as a body chosen by statesmen of different parties and different religious views can be expected to represent, the wisest, best informed, and most temperate level of opinion in the Church as a whole. Still, we must render all honour to the clergy of those days for stepping into the breach, without one thought of the consequences to themselves, and recalling the torpid spiritual sense of the people to a living consciousness of what the Church really is. In my next lecture I hope to discuss the great crusade waged by means of the *Tracts for the Times*, and with it the life and character of their chief author, who from this time forward became the actual head of the Movement, and whose illustrious name will ever be accorded a high place in the roll of English Saints.

LECTURE II.

Tracts for the Times.

(1833-1841.)



IT will be remembered that neither Keble nor Newman had attended the Hadleigh Conference in July, 1833. Though they were in full sympathy with its object, they did not approve of the means suggested to effect it. Their absence prevented any unanimous line of action. Palmer prepared his addresses, and Rose continued his *British Magazine*. But the action that arrested the attention of the careless world was set on foot by Newman. He had no intention of shackling his liberty by associating with beneficed dignitaries or persons in official position. His idea was to circulate short pithy tracts, written anonymously, without supervision, without responsibility to others, on those subjects on which the general ignorance was most profound, and the need of clearly announced principles most imperative. The idea of a tract in those days did not suggest anything intellectual. It was associated with respected elderly ladies and irreproachable young gentlemen, who stood at the corners of the streets and offered pious leaflets to all passers-by. It is needless to say the Tracts for the Times were of very different metal. They were addressed to Churchmen, specially to the clergy,

and depended for their effect, not on appeals to the feelings, but on learning and argument. They had nothing in common with the ordinary tract but the name. Yet the name was wisely adopted. It suggested broadcast diffusion, and so excited curiosity. Viewed in the light of the event, the method was amply justified, and to Newman, above all others, the credit of it is due.

Perhaps this is the place to introduce some account of this remarkable man, whose spiritual personality is in some respects the most striking in the whole annals of the Church of England, at any rate, since the Reformation. To him, as to Wesley, it happened to be separated from the Communion of his birth, not as in Wesley's case, against his intention and desire, but by a deliberate though long-delayed act of his own choice. The process by which he was led first to question, then to distrust, and finally to disbelieve altogether the claim of the Church of England to be the true Church Catholic in this country, is delineated with matchless grace and power in his *Apologia pro vita sua*, published in 1864, in answer to Charles Kingsley's embittered charges of disingenuous conduct. It is already a classic of English literature, from the purity of its style, the importance of the ground it covers, and the deep interest of its psychological revelations. It at once effected the object for which it was written. It proved beyond dispute the conscientiousness of the writer, it exhibited a character of rare delicacy and extraordinary, if over-subtle, intellectual penetration, and by its sternly checked though everywhere discernible pathos enlisted the sympathies of those who most strongly disapproved of its views.

Newman was one of two brothers, both highly endowed with mental gifts. It is curious how many of the Trac-

tarians ran in pairs of brothers: Thomas and John Keble, Thomas and James Mozley, Hurrell and Antony Froude, Robert and Henry Wilberforce, and the two Copelands. But Francis Newman was never a Churchman. Early in life he pursued that sceptical path which led him at last to deny the whole fabric of revealed religion. John Henry Newman's first impressions of Christianity were strongly Evangelical. At the early age of fifteen he passed through that spiritual experience which is known as conversion, and to the end of his life he never doubted either its reality or its permanence. When he first came to Oxford he still inclined to the same religious views. He was well read in the abler works of Calvinistic theology, and was for a time imbued with its characteristic spirit. He became a keen supporter of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was filled with a strong conviction that the Church of Rome was the Antichrist of the Revelation.

His undergraduate days were spent at Trinity College, where, long years after, he was elected to what was then the rare distinction of honorary membership of the Common Room. In 1822 he stood for an Oriel Fellowship, and was successful. Brought thus suddenly into contact with the foremost men of Oxford, he was compelled to throw aside much of his native reserve, and to give and take in the daily intellectual conflict. His disposition was restless, inquiring, argumentative, full of poetry and imagination, qualities as yet but partially developed; he was eager to impress himself on others, and yet more eager to learn from them. He was not slow to acknowledge the spell of Whateley's power. He himself tells us that through Whateley's influence he was drawn for a time in the direction of Theological Liberalism. He became Vice-Principal of St. Edmund's

Hall under Whateley's Headship, and for some years was understood to be one of his adherents. This accounts for the fact that though acquainted with Keble he did not become intimate with him, for Keble had imbibed from his earliest years such a horror of liberal ideas in politics, and still more in religion, as effectually prevented any close companionship with those who held them. It was not until 1829, seven years after Newman's election, that the two men were brought to understand one another through the agency of Hurrell Froude, an act which Froude regarded as the most meritorious of his life. From that time forward until the great break in 1845 the two names are linked together in the closest spiritual friendship.

It is remarkable that Newman, whom we are accustomed to regard as pre-eminently a leader of men, should himself confess how deeply he was influenced by others. He was indebted for important elements in his belief to Hawkins, the Provost of his College.¹ He received what afterwards became the root idea of his theology from Whateley, as I have already pointed out. He learned much from Froude, whose masculine intellect shrank from no conclusion to which the premisses logically led. Above all, he was indebted to Keble, whose principles he studied for some years at second hand through conversations with Williams and Froude. Williams, it will be remembered, had been a pupil of John Keble. He had also served as Curate to Thomas Keble, Rector of Bisley. While acting as Newman's Curate

¹ It is interesting to observe in the light of subsequent events that when on the removal of Dr. Copleston to the See of Llandaff, Keble and Hawkins were brought forward as candidates for the Provostship, Pusey, then Fellow of Oriel, supported Hawkins against Keble. This was afterwards a source of poignant grief to him. Had Keble been elected, the position of the Tractarians in Oxford must have been very different from what it was. Keble himself never received any preferment in the Church.

in Oxford he used to report to him the conversations he had held with the two brothers. Their ideas took such hold of Newman that they appeared in a new dress, Sunday after Sunday, in his sermons. Williams noted this with lively satisfaction. "It was Thomas Keble (he says) teaching Oxford by Newman through me."

It is necessary to point out this feature in Newman's character, because it helps us to understand his habit of searching for ideas from every source, and giving them a home in his mind, without considering whether or not they were capable of reconciliation.

Newman has often been spoken of as above all things a party leader. Whateley thought this of him when Newman broke away from his influence and turned towards High Church views. And the charge was repeated with still greater emphasis when his Oxford following had become numerous, when his lightest words were quoted as oracles, and his very costume, gestures, and unconscious tricks of habit, were all carefully noted and reproduced by a hundred imitators.

Yet Newman himself earnestly denies the charge. He declares that he never had any wish to form a party in the Church. He insists that all his arguments with equals or pupils were undertaken in the first place to clear his own thoughts and to satisfy his own craving for definite truth. He also points out with great force his actual unfitness to be a party leader, because just at the time when the Movement needed the most unflinching firmness of guidance, he himself was unsettled, and to use his own expression, let the reins drop from his hands.

It is well, I think, to make this point clear, because the opinion we form on it will affect our judgment of Newman's

moral character as well as of the real tendency of the Movement. That Newman on starting the Tracts felt confident of his ability to de-protestantize, or if the term be preferred, to re-catholicize, the Anglican Church, is certain. He compares himself to Luther. He speaks of the need of a new Reformation.

His confidence in himself and in the soundness of his cause was absolute. By insisting that the Tracts should be written by independent and irresponsible writers, he shook off all control from lesser minds, and secured for himself an open field. He fully realized the greatness of the task he had set before him; but he believed himself able, with the help of Keble and Froude, to fulfil it. Unfortunately, he had counted without his host. It was that very confidence in his cause that blinded him to the true tendency of his views. The logic of authority in religion, if pressed to its legitimate conclusion, can have but one result. And the first breath of misgiving swept across his mind as early as 1839. It is true the impression passed, but only to return again, and refuse to be exorcised. For six long years he found himself in the distracting position of acknowledged guide and leader of many noble and aspiring minds, while yet secretly mistrusting the counsel he was compelled by his position to give them. Yet he felt he dared not change that counsel, for though his faith in the Church of England was waning, his reason was not as yet convinced of the duty of leaving her for Rome. Consequently he continued to inculcate loyalty long after he himself had lost it. And it was the very natural, but, as he thought, unjustifiable, impatience of a young priest who, against his promise, joined the Roman communion while Newman's guest, that finally opened his eyes to the real extent of his responsibility.

Now had he been a practical party leader he would surely have acted very differently. He would have faced his doubts, and made up his mind whether he could resist them or not. In the one case, he would have crushed them then and there, and resolved that nothing should tempt him to betray them to those who clung to him for guidance. In the other case, he would have taken a bold line for Rome, regardless of the risk of convulsing the Church of his birth.

He did neither the one nor the other. He still continued to write and advise others against joining the Roman Church, even while contemplating the probability that he himself might have to join it. One cannot wonder that writers of an opposite School accuse him of disingenuousness. Even those who recognized the sanctity of his character and his purity of purpose openly avowed their distrust of his qualifications as a religious teacher. Among these was Archbishop Tait, whose conspicuous sense of justice must be set against his want of sympathy with Tractarian views. As late as 1877 he referred to the estimate of Newman's mind he had formed in the Oxford days: "I have always regarded him as having a strange duality of character. On the one side is a wonderfully strong and subtle reasoning faculty; on the other a blind faith, raised almost entirely by the emotions. It seems to me that in all matters of belief he first acts on his emotions, and then brings the subtlety of his reason to bear, till he has ingeniously persuaded himself that he is logically right. The result is a condition in which he is practically unable to distinguish between truth and falsehood."¹

If a criticism thus measured but severe was made at the time of the conflict by one of his antagonists, and repro-

¹ Tait's Life, I., p. 89.

duced forty years after with deliberate approval by the same critic, when chief Bishop of the Anglican Church, we shall not be surprised to find that other less balanced and impartial natures advanced the bitterest charges against Newman's sincerity. They do not pretend to judge him as an individual, they do not enter into the difficulties which encompassed his own mind; but they look at him as one whom multitudes acknowledged as their religious guide, and who himself posed as such. They think of his extraordinary influence. They look at the admiring disciples who were proud to call themselves his School, who professed to be guided by his lightest word. And they naturally regard Newman as consenting to this relationship, and therefore rightly held responsible for the action of his followers. And yet if we desire to be just to one whose character is in many respects that of a true saint, we must disabuse our minds of the idea that he chose for himself the position of a leader. He tells us it came to him unsought, that he never liked it, and that when his own mind became unsettled it embarrassed him so much that for some years he shut himself up in a sort of mysterious reserve in the hope that he might thus avoid its responsibilities. This was a very unfortunate course to adopt. It laid him open to the most serious of all charges, that of disloyalty to the Church of which he professed to be a member, and of want of straightforwardness in not avowing openly his position. But on careful study of the *Apologia* I think this conduct only proves that he was not by nature fitted to be a party leader, otherwise he could not have failed to see the bad effect of his policy; nor, had he been a practical man, could he have imagined for one moment that after leading so many souls a certain way he could retard their adoption of the logical result of his example

by any individual scruples of his own. It is always extremely difficult for ordinary minds to understand original minds, and to gauge the sensitive temperament of genius. It is necessary to approach the task of criticizing such men with the utmost possible diffidence. There is always the temptation to put down actions that appear to us inconsistent as the result of ambition or dishonesty. At the same time, we have an undoubted right to form an opinion on their conduct, and when the events have become matters of history, we need not shrink from examining them in the light of ordinary human motives. Of all Newman's friends there was not one that knew him better or loved him better than his Curate, Isaac Williams, and he was almost the only one whose affectionate intercourse was never interrupted even by the disasters of 1845, and who saw him and talked freely to him till his own death in 1865. Yet this is what Williams tells us was the impression made on him by Newman's character at the time of his first acquaintance: "I became at once very much attached to Newman, won by his kindness and delighted by his good and wonderful qualities, and he proposed that I should be his Curate at St. Mary's. This brought me into still closer intercourse with him. I have lately heard it stated by one of his oldest friends, Dr. Jelf of Christ Church, that his mind was always essentially Jesuitical. In endeavouring to account for this statement, I can remember a strong feeling of difference I first felt in acting together with Newman from what I had been accustomed to; that he was in the habit of looking for effect, for what was sensibly effective, which from the School of the two Kebles I had long been habituated to avoid. I had been taught there to do one's duty in faith, and leave the effect to God, and *that* all the more earnestly because

there were no sympathies from without to answer. There was a felt but unexpressed dissonance of this kind, but perhaps it became harmonized as we acted together." Here we see most delicately indicated an impatience, an egotism, if we may so call it, which craved for personal appreciation in an outward form. And in another passage this saintly friend of Newman's speaks thus of him: "The domestic and poetic and social element in Newman's character appeared to me providentially intended to correct that constitutional restlessness of intellect, that want of balance and repose in the soul, which appears the malady of both the brothers. But our Newman, partly from circumstances and partly under the false guise of mortification, has stifled those domestic affections, thereby greatly increasing his intellectual malady; whereas I never thought so highly of him, and he never seemed to me so saint-like and high in his character, as when he was with his mother and sisters. The softness and repose of his nature then came out, and so corrected that restless intellect to which he has been a prey."

These gentle but searching criticisms from the friend on earth who knew him best reveal to us certain imperfections of character, which ought not to be disregarded in our estimate of what he was. One more quotation from the same author will, I am sure, be of interest. "I watched from the beginning, and saw among ourselves greater dangers than those from without, which I attempted to obviate by publishing the 'Plain Sermons.' I attempted in vain to get the Kebles to publish, in order to keep pace with Newman, and give a more practical turn to the Movement. I remember C. Cornish coming to me (in 1834) and saying, as we walked in Trinity Gardens, 'People are a little afraid

of being carried away by Newman's brilliancy ; they want more of the steady sobriety of the Kebles to keep us safe. We have so much sail : we want ballast.' " Again : " Nothing had as yet impaired my friendship for Newman. We lived daily very much together ; but I had a secret uneasiness, not from anything said or implied, but from a want of repose about his character, that he would start into some line different from Keble and Pusey, though I knew not in what direction it would be."

It is evident from these and similar early testimonies that even his friends and fellow labourers did not clearly understand Newman's mind. In fact, he was a man apart, a man of subtle genius, originally gifted with social affection, poetic imagination and intellect, but driven by an inner impulse to subordinate the two former to the latter, and to follow its guidance exclusively, as he himself confesses.

But the most important difference between Newman and the other Tractarian leaders was not of temperament or genius, but of early training. It used to be commonly reported that most of the original Tract writers had joined the Church of Rome. As a matter of fact, only one of the entire number of fourteen¹ did so, and that one was Newman.

It was also commonly said that most of them had been brought up in the Evangelical School. As a matter of fact, this is true of only one of them, and that one was Newman.

Now it is worth while to notice this point. Newman himself mentions it. He tells us that at the age of fifteen the idea was borne in upon him that in all the universe there were but two supreme and luminously self-evident beings, himself and his Creator ; and that he was pre-

¹ The others were H. Froude, John Keble, Thomas Keble, Arthur Perceval, T. Mozley, I. Williams, E. B. Pusey, Benjamin Harrison, W. Palmer, Sir G. Prevost, Antony Buller, R. F. Wilson, and John Bowden.

destined to eternal life. This idea, he says, gradually faded away; but the inward conversion which came with it he regarded ever after as the most certain fact of his life. All his early religious impressions came from the School of Calvin. They were profound, they were real; but they were not the teaching of the Anglican Church. When he first awoke to that Church's teaching as embodied in the Prayer Book, the Homilies, the Canons, and the great Caroline Divines, it came to him with the force of novelty; his mind was not prepared for it. It was, therefore, not to be wondered at that a second change of conviction should come upon him, inasmuch as the first had no deep roots in the associations of his childhood. On the other hand, those who shared with him the first responsibilities of the Movement had all received an early training in the principles of the Prayer Book. To them the Movement was not the introduction to new truth, but the setting forth in a new form of truths they had always believed, though they had not always realized them. I do not wish to base any general argument upon this fact. It would be unfair and unwise to do so. But in justice to the tendency of the Movement, we have a right to make it perfectly clear that not one of those originators of it, who had from infancy been taught the principles of Anglican Churchmanship, left the Church of his birth.

We pass now from Newman himself to the fortunes of the Movement of which he was the inspiring influence. Within a short time the authors and disseminators of the Tracts came to be known by the name of Tractarians. This epithet is frequently applied to the whole School; but, strictly speaking, the Tractarians were only its original supporters, who differed in very important respects from the

later so-called Tractarian School. The reception of the earlier Tracts both in and out of Oxford was encouraging. The first Tract dealt with the Apostolic Succession, and made a stirring appeal to the clergy to rest all their claims to respect on this basis, and not on those of wealth, family, position, or State support. "Do this," he says, "now, before you are forced to it. For a time will come when you will have no other outward title to reverence." Others followed in quick succession; some on religious duties enjoined in the Prayer Book, but generally neglected; others on points of doctrine; others contained passages from Anglican divines, justifying the principles of the Movement. All were short, pithy, and to the point. They at once aroused the attention of the public, as well as of the Church. The attitude of the three Church parties was on the whole what we should have expected. The Low Church dreaded them. The Liberal or Broad Church disliked them. The High Church welcomed them. At first, however, the Evangelical opposition was not very pronounced, though several leading men took part in it. There was a disposition to wait and see what would happen, and particularly to watch for any sign of a Romeward tendency.

The leaders, however, were full of hope. To them, and particularly to Newman, it was a campaign against Religious Liberalism, in which he would neither give nor receive quarter, and which he hoped would end in the complete discomfiture of his enemy and its banishment from the Anglican Church. To Newman Liberalism or Broad Churchism was simply Rationalism in disguise. It must inevitably lead to the destruction of all dogma, and in so doing remove the only barrier to absolute Infidelity. In Newman's opinion the Protestant element in our Church

was purely negative. It lived by opposition to the claims of Rome, and was in no respect a positive body of faith. If our Church was to hold her own as a system of truth, against Romanism and Rationalism alike, it must be by resting all her weight on the Catholic doctrines she had inherited from antiquity, and rejecting all the Lutheran and Calvinist elements that had intruded themselves into her. With the first Reformers he had no sympathy whatever. But our Reformation was a process that extended over a century and a half, and included, not only nor chiefly the divines of Edward VI., but much more those of the later Elizabethan and Caroline times, and last, but not least, the Non-Jurors under William III. Newman's aim was to bring the Church back to at least the position it held under Bramhall, Bull, Warburton, or Ken. In all this his purpose was doctrinal and disciplinary; that of the theologian, not of the ecclesiastical statesman. The connection of Church and State had but a secondary interest for him. It was not essential to the well-being, far less to the being, of the Church. But he did not attack it. He contented himself with pointing out that the Church is a spiritual body, whose laws and government are derived from Christ, and that with these the State has no right to interfere.

It was towards the close of 1833 that he made his first attempt to gain the adherence of Dr. Pusey. This great man, as remarkable for stern holiness of life as for a depth of theological learning unique in the Church of his day, well deserves the title of the second head of the Movement. He was a year older than Newman, and well fitted by his aristocratic birth, high position, abilities, and weight of character, to assume an authoritative part. Himself a former Fellow of Oriel, he had known Newman, but not

intimately; and having applied himself with prodigious industry to Oriental studies, he had been appointed before the age of thirty to the high post of Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. Already he had become one of the leading men of the University. He had twice visited Germany, and there, while attending theological lectures at Göttingen and Berlin, had become intimately acquainted with the most famous professors. Pusey's experience of German Universities opened his eyes to the defects of English scholarship. In the first place he saw with amazement the enormous range of study and the colossal knowledge which German theologians thought necessary before they posed as teachers. And the lesson of laborious work learned among them he utilized to the utmost. No German scholar is more conscientiously thorough in studying all that is anywhere written on a subject than he. Caring nothing for style, nothing for imaginative appeals, he wields the sledge-hammer of an erudition which even his bitterest enemies admitted to be without a rival in England. But this was by no means the only impression he derived from his sojourn in Germany. He brought back with him the alarming conviction that German theological criticism was sapping the foundations of Christian belief with weapons so insidious and so powerful that, except God should specially prepare our English Church to resist them, the result would probably be the collapse of the nation's faith. Actuated by this overwhelming anxiety Pusey returned to England fully determined to vindicate for the Church of England the whole of that Catholic theology which in ancient days had withstood the heresies that assailed the early Church, and which alone, so he believed, could stem the tide of rationalistic criticism in the future,

whenever it should come. The brilliance of German theology was not without some influence upon his judgment. And a book he wrote on it was misjudged by some critics, including Rose, as showing a dangerous sympathy with its methods. Pusey himself withdrew the book, and expressed sorrow for having written it. But, strictly speaking, it was not subject to the accusation made against it. Pusey grasped quite clearly from the first the position which he held to the end. And though he approached nearer in many points to Rome as years went on, there is no indication that his judgment ever wavered on the Catholicism of our Church, or that any decision of the Privy Council, short of unmistakeable denial of the Creed, would ever have driven him out of it.

Such was the man to whom Newman appealed to throw in his lot with the Movement. Pusey did not at first consent. Newman begged him at least to write a Tract, that Oxford might know him to be in general sympathy with the writers. This Pusey, after some hesitation, promised to do, but on the condition that he should be allowed to append his initials to it. He then wrote the Tract on Fasting, which, being the only one bearing signature, was at once identified as Pusey's, and this led to the name of Puseyite being affixed to the Movement by the public. In Oxford its nickname was Newmania, which proves that the University regarded Newman as the chief author. But in the world at large Puseyite was the name that stuck. Not only in England, but on the Continent and in America the new opinions were watched with interest, and Pusey, almost before he had endorsed them, was held to be their author.

In this matter, as in so many others, the popular instinct was on the whole right. If there is one man who can be called the presiding genius of the Movement from first to

last, that man is Pusey. He alone had the weight of character, the governing qualities, the inflexibility of will, the ever available knowledge, the diplomatic dexterity, that are as necessary to guide a religious as a political party. In spite of his seclusion from society, Pusey was nevertheless a genuine man of affairs, as those who desired to thwart him frequently found to their cost. Neither Keble nor Newman, even had they been placed in Pusey's position, could have steered the party as he steered it, for neither possessed the gift of rule, which Pusey possessed in a very high degree.

We may therefore regard the accession of Pusey in 1834 as an epoch in the Movement. As Newman says, he was a very awful person. Not only was he on an equality with the Heads of Houses, that close oligarchy which governed Oxford, and so raised far above a mere College Fellow, but it was still more his personal character that made men stand in awe of him, his austerity, his uncompromisingness, his severe detachment from the world. No wonder Newman rejoiced at gaining him. He thought things must needs go well in such company.

Pusey entered into the Movement with views of his own. He had always felt great sympathy for the Evangelical School, not so much for its doctrinal tenets as for its insistence upon personal holiness and its detachment from the world. This sympathetic attitude remained unchanged through all the conflicts and misunderstandings of the years that followed. It gave him the sincerest pleasure to find himself able to co-operate with the leaders of Evangelical thought. It gave him real pain to be obliged to act in opposition to them. To Pusey, therefore, the Movement appeared not only as a reaction of Christian belief against

the negative position of Liberalism, but also as the appropriate completion of the earlier Evangelical movement, by adding to it that element of Church authority which alone could give coherence to the truths it preached. If this were not accepted, then he feared that Evangelical truth itself might be lost.

Again, Pusey was not satisfied with the short Tracts that had been issued. They did not indicate with sufficient clearness the body of learning upon which their conclusions rested. In his hands a Tract became a ponderous theological treatise. His three Tracts on Baptism make up a book of nearly 500 pages, bristling with scholarly quotations and crammed with severe argument. He at once communicated to the Movement a learned and antiquarian tone, and aimed at turning the occasional Tracts into a systematized body of Anglican theology.

It is now time to ask the question, What was the attitude of the rulers of the Church towards the Movement? At first they made no sign. Archbishop Howley and the Bishops of London and Oxford,¹ from respect for the men, were friendly to the Movement. The University authorities, on the other hand, distrusted it from the first, though several years elapsed before they took open action against it.

There was an ex-Fellow of Oriel named Hampden, who had been Bampton Lecturer in 1832.² His subject had been the theology of the Schoolmen. He had endeavoured to prove that all dogmatic creeds are the product of scholasticism, (by which he meant the reasonings of human philosophy,) and therefore ought not to be binding on any

¹ Drs. Blomfield and Bagot.

² A series of sermons preached annually before the University, in accordance with the provisions of Dr. Bampton's foundation, for the defence of the Christian faith.

man's belief. In 1836 the Regius Professorship of Divinity fell vacant, to which the Crown appoints. Lord Melbourne, after consulting the Archbishop, appointed Dr. Hampden. At once there was a commotion in Oxford. A protest was raised, and Pusey and Newman took the lead in it. It must be remembered that Oxford was then the professed nursery of Church doctrines. Hampden's views appeared to Newman, and to many besides him, subversive of the Catholic position. Not only the entire High Church contingent, but many Evangelicals also, united to resist his appointment. They were not successful. He was made Professor, but, contrary to expectation, exercised little or no influence in the University. Some years later he was appointed to the Bishopric of Hereford in the face of a still stronger protest, but apparently without the result which was feared, of his using his office to propagate his views.

It had always been Pusey's dominant apprehension that of all the dangers which threatened our Church the inroads of infidelity were the greatest. It was against these that he desired to re-erect her fortress of Catholic doctrine. It was these that in the person of Hampden he persistently and inflexibly withstood. In thus estimating the quarter from which peril was likely to arise, Pusey was in agreement with a Churchman of a very different school, Archbishop Tait, who on more than one occasion declared that excesses of ritual were less to be dreaded than the spread of rationalizing views. This has not been so commonly admitted, even by far-seeing men, as to make it irrelevant to call attention to the point. Pusey's outlook was so wide, and his spiritual sensitiveness so delicate, that a view thus tenaciously held by him demands the most serious attention.

In his letters at the time he makes an interesting classification of the different kinds of infidelity, which in regard to the disquieting developments that have since appeared I think you will wish me to record.

1. There is the infidelity of the Latin nations, Italy and France, which springs from a reaction against the tyranny and superstitions of modern Romanism as popularly taught and practised. This takes the form either of total indifference to revealed religion, or of fierce opposition to its dogmas and restraints on conduct.

2. There is the speculative infidelity of Germany, produced by the self-confident and over-bold criticism of Holy Scripture, as if it was to be treated exactly as any other book. This leads to Rationalism, or the idea that human science can explain, not indeed the inner mysteries themselves, but the way in which people have come to believe them; and that this psychological explanation of dogma is in truth the only one possible to us. In Pusey's day this form of infidelity was almost unknown in English society, but has now firmly established itself.

3. There is the infidelity to which Englishmen are most prone, which arises from their love of freedom and dislike of all definite spiritual authority. In England there is not (or was not) the intellectual opposition to the Christian Revelation that we find elsewhere, but there is a decided preference for an easy, undefined, general belief in God and Christ, without acceptance of the intellectual conditions on which that belief is declared to save us. This is what is now so popular as Undogmatic or Udenominational Religion. It had no name in those days, but it was practically what Hampden preached. Pusey does not go so far as to call this infidelity, for, of course, it is not. But he declares that

it necessarily leads to infidelity. And this is why he so sternly opposed it.

The opposition to Dr. Hampden had divided the University into two parties, the orthodox and the liberal. But so far the Tractarians had not been thrown into opposition to the great body of Churchmen. Nevertheless, much uneasiness was already felt as to their teaching in many quarters. It was quite evident that what the Tracts pronounced to be the teaching of our Church was very different from what the University authorities regarded as such. The work of the Reformers they cried down as unfortunate and mistaken, and men were directed to the primitive Fathers as the true exponents of the mind of our Church. In order to impress this the more unmistakeably, Pusey started the gigantic task of translating the chief works of all those Fathers who are accepted as authorities alike by the Churches of England, of Rome, and of the East. This colossal undertaking was commenced in 1838, and continued from time to time by various translators until 1885, under the title of the Library of the Fathers. It has had a profound influence upon Churchmanship. It has excited a widespread interest in the history and doctrines of the undivided Church, and has become a strong weapon in our hands against the innovations in faith and practice introduced by the Church of Rome. Its influence has extended itself far beyond the limits of the High Church section; and, indeed, both in Germany and America, some of the profoundest Patristic scholars are found among those most opposed to the Anglo-Catholic idea. Up till then the Fathers had been, as it were, given away to Rome, and it was taken for granted that they favoured the Roman position. Yet the Convocation of 1571 had sanctioned the Canon of our Church

which refers all doctrine to Holy Scripture and the Fathers, together with the Thirty-nine Articles. At the same time, it appealed to the Fathers, not as authorities, but only as witnesses, *i.e.*, so far as they attested the sense of Scripture which had been always received in the early Church.

About this time the Roman Catholic authorities became alive to the importance of taking advantage of the revival of Church feeling in England to further the interests of their own body. In 1836 Monsignor Wiseman, Principal of the English College in Rome, was sent to England in the hope that his great abilities and wonderfully persuasive personality might bring anxious inquirers within the attractions of the Roman system. Wiseman delivered a series of lectures in London, which attracted general attention. The lecturer took advantage of his popularity to enter into controversy with the Tractarian School. He accused its leaders of teaching Roman doctrines, while refusing to take the step which logically followed from holding them. Both Newman and Pusey were ready to accept his challenge. Newman tells us that at this time (1837-1839) his Anglican position was at its height, and his confidence in the Church of England unshaken. He was therefore able to devote his whole power to meeting Wiseman's attacks, without the depressing consciousness of any possible weak points in his armour. His answer was embodied in a book called "The Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism." The ideas of the book had taken shape in the form of lectures delivered in a side-chapel of St. Mary's, Oxford, on the history of the Church. They had been carefully prepared, much discussed, and so far definitely adopted as to be available for a systematic work.

The Prophetical Office is one of Newman's most important writings. It sets forth very clearly the difference between Anglicanism and Romanism. While allowing that Rome has been more successful in preserving Catholic unity, it shows that she has in many respects broken away from the faith of antiquity. Newman claims for ourselves the right to bring into prominence all those features of our Church which display its Catholicity, while he calls upon Rome to review her authorized teaching in accordance with the faith once delivered to the saints. He vindicates for the English Church a middle position, which he calls the *Via Media*, between the extremes of Romanism and Protestantism. He asserts that this is no merely negative attitude, no mere receding from excess or defect; but that it embodies a constructive religious process, an objective and real faith, with a threefold basis, viz., dogma, the sacramental system, and opposition to Rome.

The controversy was continued during 1837 by W. Palmer in his able "Treatise on the Christian Church," a polemical work, which Newman informs us was highly considered by his Roman Catholic opponents, and taken in hand by Father Perrone. Palmer was successful in showing that Wiseman had rested important parts of his case upon inaccurate quotations. Wiseman's strongest point was his largeness of view, his noble enthusiasm, and his many-sided culture. Palmer was a man of much more limited capacity, but within his limits extremely learned and accurate. He has expressed himself with great severity as to the controversial methods permitted by Roman Catholics. Undoubtedly his advice, founded on his own practice, is excellent, never to accept a quotation from an opponent until you have verified it yourself from the original source.

These publications, however, did but little to allay the growing uneasiness. By way of putting the sincerity of the leaders to a crucial test, a proposal was made in 1838 by leading University men to erect in Oxford a memorial to the three chief Reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, as having suffered death for their faith. Pusey was at first not unwilling to subscribe. But Newman and Keble held aloof. Pusey would not separate himself from them. He proposed as an alternative that an inscription should be set up acknowledging the value of the Reformation, but not identifying it with any particular names. This, however, met with little or no support. In the end a handsome cross was raised in one of the finest sites in Oxford, with statues of the three Reformers, called the Martyrs' Memorial. The refusal of the Tractarian leaders to support this naturally raised fresh suspicions. Hostility gathered fast. Bishop Bagot, of Oxford, whose truly Christian kindness and generosity of heart Newman always gratefully acknowledged, mentioned the Tracts in his Charge in a manner which, though balanced, seemed to Newman to imply disapproval. This was in 1838.¹ Newman felt deeply aggrieved. He wrote to the Bishop offering to stop the Tracts. His feelings may be gathered from the following words, written afterwards to Pusey: "My Bishop was my Pope. I knew no other: the successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ . . . and he had charged against me." It seemed to him as if he was condemned. He thought of resigning his vicarage, but was dissuaded from doing so by Pusey. An idea, however, entered his mind, which he carried into effect a year or two later, of retiring to Littlemore, a village three miles from Oxford, of which he held the cure, and there erecting a

¹ The incident is mentioned in the *Apologia*, p. 157. Edition of 1864.

small monastery,¹ where, in company with like-minded friends, he might devote himself entirely to the religious life, and retire from his position as leader of the Movement.

There were other signs of storms ahead. The publication about this time of Froude's *Remains*² by Newman and Keble gave great displeasure to many leading High Churchmen. As I have already said, Froude was second to none of the leaders of the Movement, either in ability or earnestness. But he died before his mind had acquired the temperance of expression advisable in a religious controversialist. His extreme, almost reckless, outspokenness on every subject, though valuable from his sincerity, and important from his great talents, was liable to misconstruction. It was from his diary, written in 1833, that the following sentence was taken, which has been more than once quoted with damaging effect by opponents as a frank admission of disloyalty to our Church. He mentions having when in Rome called on Dr. Wiseman, "who has enlightened Newman and me on the subject of our relations to the Church of Rome. We got introduced to him to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole."³ On the surface these words appear to have but one meaning. They appear to declare with suicidal frankness that at the very time when Newman

¹ He calls it a *μονή*, the same word that is used in St. John's Gospel, and translated *mansion* in our Bible.

² Froude died of consumption in 1836, and left a large number of mostly unfinished writings, which were edited in four volumes by Newman and Keble some years afterwards.

³ Froude's *Remains*, Vol. I., p. 307, quoted in Palmer's *Narrative of Events*, p. 41.

and Froude were writing the hardest possible things of Rome, they were actually intriguing to be received into the Roman Communion. No wonder that the publication of such sentiments shocked the feelings of Englishmen. No wonder that they surrounded not only the memory of Froude himself, but the names of the two clergymen who had deliberately chosen to give them to the world, with an atmosphere of deep-seated mistrust. And yet there can be little doubt that the obvious interpretation is the wrong one. There was that in Froude which all who knew him agree would never have allowed him to join the Roman Church. Strange as it may appear, I believe the true meaning of his impulsive and misleading words was this—He wished to find out on what conditions the Roman Church would admit our Church to communion. He expected some of these conditions to be difficult, which he expresses by the highly improper term of “twisting our consciences.” But when he found, as all have found, that Rome never wavers in her demands, and will accept nothing less than absolute submission, he realized that the idea was hopeless. But though I have no doubt he meant this, the written language remains, and in the eyes of an opponent it must ever bear a construction unfavourable to his sincerity. Dean Church, who is throughout the staunchest friend of the Movement, admits that the publication of Froude’s Remains was an unwise step, and alienated many from it.

Another serious shock was given to Church people at the same time by the title of one of the Tracts, published in 1838 by Isaac Williams, who, it will be remembered, was Newman’s Curate. The title was, “On Reserve in Religious Teaching,” and a year later a second Tract appeared with the same title. It would hardly be too much to say that

the Church at large was scandalized. Not only the religious press, not only numbers of Evangelical clergymen, but the bench of Bishops also were now thoroughly roused. Nearly all of them condemned the Tract, as contrary to the principles of the Gospel and to the declaration of the Apostle Paul that he had not shunned to declare to his converts the whole counsel of God. The idea of putting forward one teaching for the multitude and another for the initiated is so repugnant to the mind of our Church, and, as we believe, to the New Testament, that there can be no question about condemning it with the most unsparing severity. Yet even so, it was hard that the Tract should be condemned unread. And a very large number of those who condemned it confessed that they had not read it. The fact is, the title was misleading. Isaac Williams had not considered fully the shock it would give to people's minds. And although I am willing to grant that the title, whether justified by the contents or not, is a sufficient ground of censure, I do not believe from the portion I have read that Williams intended to keep back any part of the message of salvation, but merely wished to follow the caution of the early Fathers in accommodating spiritual truth to the capacities of those to whom it was addressed, giving milk to babes and strong meat to full grown men. But, in truth, there was a ground of weakness deeper and far more serious than any mere mistake or chance imprudence. Newman's own mind was becoming unsettled. He had begun to doubt whether the Church of his birth was really, as he had so strongly asserted it to be, a branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ. The first misgiving had come to him when studying the Monophysite controversy early in 1839. "I saw (he says) my face in the mirror of the early Church,

and I was a Monophysite."¹ But the misgiving passed, only to reappear again later in the same year through an article in the *Dublin Review* by Bishop Wiseman on the Roman claim. The subject was the controversy between St. Augustine and the Donatists, with an application to Anglicanism. The Donatists, by persisting in their schismatical views, had cut themselves off from the body of the Church. The argument that Wiseman triumphantly brings to bear against Anglicanism is the same that Augustine launches against Donatus—"Securus judicat orbis Terrarum": "Impartial mankind is the judge." The entire world persisted in regarding St. Augustine as representing the Catholic Church, and Donatus as representing a sect. So now (he says) the indifferent world acknowledges Roman Catholicism to be the genuine representative of Christianity, and Anglicanism as a mere local modification of it. This Latin phrase kept ringing in his ears. He compares it to the "Turn again, Whittington," or the "Tolle lege" which St. Augustine heard, both of them prophetic voices which altered the whole future of those that heard them. "It was as if I had seen a ghost. The heavens had opened and closed again. My thought had been, The Church of Rome will be found right after all: and then it had vanished."

It is evident that Newman could not now escape from reopening the whole question—What is the Church? Wherein does its unity consist? And to this he applied himself with all earnestness. He published his views in an article in the *British Critic* in 1840 (of which he was editor) "On the

¹ By this he does not mean that the Anglican Church teaches identically the doctrine of the Monophysites, but that the doctrinal and disciplinary attitude of Rome with regard to Anglicanism is similar to that of the Orthodox Church towards the ancient heresy. "It is difficult to make out how the Monophysites were heretics, unless Anglicans are so too. But the former *are* heretics. Therefore the latter must be." *Cf. Apologia*, p. 209.

Catholicity of the English Church." In this he put forward the marks of our Church which unite it in doctrine and discipline with primitive Christianity, and also with such features in the Church of Rome as are not exclusively Roman, but primitive and universal. The great stumbling-block to the convincingness of his argument was the existence of the Thirty-nine Articles in the Prayer Book, which were generally understood to be directed, not only against the popular corruptions of Romanism, but against its formal decrees; and also were believed to lay down as essential portions of the Church of England's faith, doctrines on the sufficiency of Scripture, justification, and election, which were newly delivered at the Reformation, and opposed to the tradition of the Catholic Church.

Newman therefore set himself to examine the Articles, and find out whether the popular interpretation is the only one admissible. As the result of this examination is the turning-point of the whole Movement, I propose to defer it till my next lecture, which will include the period from the publication of Tract 90 to the withdrawal of Newman from communion with our Church.

LECTURE III.

From Tract 90 to the Secession of Newman.

(1841-1845.)

THOSE who have followed me thus far will remember that the main object of the Tractarian writers was to bring clearly into view those ultimate principles on which the Church of England rests her claim to speak to the nation with authority, as the accredited representative in this country of the faith of Christ.

Newman, as the guiding spirit of the Movement, had faced this problem with the utmost precision. He had compared the system of our Church with that of Rome on the one hand, and of the Protestant sects on the other. And he believed he had disengaged from the multitude of controversial arguments three main sources of authority, to which the Church of England was content to appeal. The first was Antiquity, *i.e.*, the decisions of the Councils and consent of the Fathers of the undivided Church in matters of doctrine and worship. The second was the Apostolical Succession, *i.e.*, the unbroken transmission of Orders from the times of the Apostles through the historic Episcopate, for the administration of the Sacraments. The third was the Appeal of the National Conscience against the unfounded

claims and unscriptural abuses of the Church of Rome. This was the special element introduced by the Reformation. It is embodied in that part of the Prayer Book which alone is of contemporary origin, viz., the Thirty-nine Articles, which lay down the position of our Church towards the leading controversies of the day.

Let us endeavour to illustrate these principles in a simple and intelligible manner. (1) First, that of *Antiquity*. The watchword of the Catholic Church is admirably given in the words of St. Vincent of Lerins, so often quoted, "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,*" *i.e.*, It teaches that which has been taught always, everywhere, and by all. This is the Catholic idea, viz., a nucleus or deposit of doctrine, once for all delivered to the Apostles, and ever since taught with authority by those who occupy their seat. This deposit can never be altered, never added to, nor diminished. In its substance it is absolutely unchanging. But it admits of expansion, as the bud expands into the flower. It is capable of continuous restatement from age to age, in terms corresponding to successive forms of human thought, according as the controversies of the time bring into prominence one or other of its essential elements.

For example, the doctrine of the Trinity, though implied in the New Testament, is not explicitly laid down there. It was not until three centuries after the Apostles' time that this great doctrine received its final shape. But it is undoubtedly part of the Apostolic deposit. Though not explicit, it is implicit in Scripture. It is not an addition to the Apostles' teaching, it is an amplification or unfolding of it, just in the same way as St. Paul's doctrine of justification is not an addition to the teaching of Christ, but only an expansion or systematization of it.

Now as long as the Church was really one and undivided, her original doctrine is easy to identify. She was able to purge herself of discordant elements. She cast out those who denied the Trinity, or the Divinity of Christ; they could not maintain their position in the Christian body. All those who remained in that body held substantially the same doctrine. Consequently, speaking generally, up to the sixth century the formula of St. Vincent can legitimately be applied—"Always, everywhere, by all." And Newman thought he could apply it successfully also to the Anglican Church. We appeal to antiquity, and on the whole we are true to antiquity. There may be some differences, but not on vital points. Speaking broadly, the worship and teaching of our Prayer Book and our great divines is based on that of the Church of the first five centuries.

(2) In the second place, Newman pointed out that we had retained the Apostolic ministry, which we put forward as a guarantee, and which he held to be the only guarantee, for valid sacraments. Historically speaking, we had clung to Episcopacy when all the other Reformed Churches had cast it away. The line of Anglican orders is unbroken. Whatever powers Christ's commission to the Twelve and their successors bestowed, those powers remain with us, so far as their historical transmission from hand to hand can guarantee them. Moreover, the intention of the Church of England is to retain the sacramental endowments which were claimed by the undivided Church. No one can read the Services for Consecration of Bishops and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, bound up with the Prayer Book, without seeing that they deliberately profess to retain the custom and the intention of the primitive Church. There is absolutely nothing new about them. They are entirely built on

primitive Christianity. And the administration of the sacraments is based upon them. No sacrament is allowed to be administered except by a lawful minister, *i.e.*, one episcopally ordained. What is called high sacramental doctrine is plainly taught in every service. The Lord's Supper is the communication of Christ's Body and Blood. Baptism is spiritual regeneration. Marriage is a lifelong vow, which no human authority can dissolve. Confession, either in sickness or before Holy Communion, is followed by Absolution, or the authoritative declaration by the Priest of forgiveness of sins by God. Confirmation is no mere profession of Christianity, but the gift by laying on of hands of the Holy Ghost. So far Newman felt he was on sure ground in claiming for our Church true Catholicity, *i.e.*, essential unity, both in doctrine and discipline, with the one mystical body of Christ.

(3) But when he came to the third court of appeal, the Thirty-nine Articles, he was startled to find in them a great deal that appeared to have a different character. Popular religious opinion regarded the Articles as furnishing the latest and most trustworthy summary of the faith of our Church. It therefore insisted that the rest of the Prayer Book should be interpreted in subordination to them, and not that they should be interpreted in subordination to the rest of the Prayer Book. The Articles were popularly viewed as the stronghold of our Protestantism. They were directly aimed at those Roman errors which the Reformation cast aside, and they formed, so to speak, the special and differentiating element in our Church. They were required to be signed by all undergraduates of the University at their matriculation, and again by all those who were admitted to any office either of instruction or adminis-

tration in it. Newman himself had signed them when he took Holy Orders. He was bound, if he was an honest man, to be willing, when called upon, to sign them again, or else he could not hope to justify his retention of a place in the ministry of our Church.

When, therefore, he came to consider the position of the Articles in connection with the other two tests of Catholicity before mentioned, he came to them with a prepossession already formed, that inasmuch as our Church was indeed a branch of the Church Catholic, her Articles must of necessity be in agreement with the other two tests. And the task he set himself was to prove that they were in such agreement.

This task he performed to his own satisfaction in Tract 90. It is important we should clearly understand what was the spirit in which he approached this problem. In the first place he brushed aside, as of no value at all, the popular interpretation of the Articles. It might be right, or it might be wrong. But, in his opinion, it was a mere unscientific impression or prejudice, founded not on argument, but on custom, repeated from mouth to mouth by superficial and often ignorant persons, who were fitted neither by temper nor by learning to lay down the true canon of interpretation. He attached no weight to the mere numbers of those who supported it. The majority of mankind had been on the wrong side before ; they might be on the wrong side again. That remained to be seen.

Then again, Newman did not conceive himself to be bound by a strictly historical or literary interpretation. This is an important point. Most critics, when they set themselves to explain the meaning of a literary document, begin by investigating the actual circumstances amid which it arose. They estimate the influences which acted upon the

writer's mind. They endeavour to enter into his thought, and to ascertain exactly the sense in which he wrote, and if that sense is found to be in accordance with the grammatical construction of his words they have no hesitation in declaring this to be the true signification. I do not say that Newman under-estimated, far less neglected, this portion of his task. He was abundantly qualified by his wide reading and practice in historical studies to understand the exact questions which those who drew up the Articles had before them. In several cases he did understand them thoroughly, and in others, where his prejudices led him wrong, he undoubtedly threw an original and suggestive light upon the different influences that moulded the language of the Reformers.

But his main argument was this. I am putting it into my own words, but believe that I am fairly representing the problem that was before his mind. "I do not care to go too minutely into the original sense of the Articles. What they meant to those who drew them up is not the chief question for me. I want to know what I mean by them. They are required of me as a test of my orthodoxy. Nor are they required only of me and such as think as I do. Other persons, holding widely different views from mine on some of the most important questions in religion, are also required to subscribe to them, and to teach in accordance with their doctrines. Now can it for a moment be conceived that these persons and I, in accepting the Articles, mean to accept precisely the same thing? Most certainly we do not. And I claim the right to show that the Articles admit of a very wide latitude of construction; that what I mean by them has as good a right to be counted a fair and honest subscription as what they mean has. But if this be so, it will be necessary to put aside all prepossessions, all preju-

dices, all historical helps and elucidations ; everything, in short, which does not bear upon their actual literal signification at the present day. We must construe the Articles just as we should construe an Act of Parliament, not according to what the framers intended, but according to what the words will bear. And if the wording of the Articles is so vague as to tolerate, not only a distinctively Protestant, but also a Catholic interpretation, then it is fair to take advantage of that vagueness, and insist on our right to whichever of the two interpretations we prefer." Such were the exegetical principles that Newman applied in general to all the Articles, and in detail to a considerable number of them.

The conclusions he drew were sufficiently startling to the average Churchman. Several of the very Articles that had always been quoted as condemning Roman doctrine were now shown to be quite compatible with it, as being directed, not against the authoritative teaching of the Roman Church, but only against its prevalent and widely tolerated abuses. This was the case with the Articles on General Councils, the Sacrifices of Masses, Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints. In this way Newman satisfied himself that all the Articles could be brought into harmony with primitive Catholicity, and he went so far as to express his gratitude that God should so have over-ruled the intention of the writers that, although they intended to condemn Catholic doctrine, their words turn out to be susceptible of an interpretation in perfect harmony with it.

Such was the origin of Tract 90, the most celebrated of all the Tracts. Newman himself had not the slightest suspicion of the storm it was to evoke. It is characteristic of his mind that when a course of reasoning led him to any conclusion he at once accepted it, even though opposed to

his former convictions. Until now he had considered the Articles a difficulty. After writing Tract 90 he considered them a difficulty no longer.

But the great majority of people, both in the University and in the Church, viewed the matter in a very different light. To them Newman's principles of interpretation appeared more like sophistry than honest argument. One of the Bishop's chaplains voiced the common feeling when he said that read in this way the Articles might mean anything or nothing. A perfect storm of indignation arose. The half-stifled, long repressed suspicion of the Academical world burst forth. Four Tutors, headed by Tait, of Balliol, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, issued a protest, calling upon the author to avow his name, and declaring that his reasonings cut at the root of all *bonâ fide* subscription. Newman accepted the challenge. He avowed himself responsible for the Tract, and undertook to defend his views, only asking a few days' grace in which to prepare his vindication. The authorities, however, did not wait for this, but took immediate steps against him. The Hebdomadal Board, which then governed the University, passed a vote of censure upon the Tract, which they posted up in every College, to the following effect: "Resolved that modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object and are inconsistent with a due observance of the University Statutes."

This, of course, amounted to a declaration of war. Henceforth the University was divided into two rival camps, and hostile pamphlets ceased not to pour forth day by day,

arraigning or defending the honesty of the Tract. The whole Church was profoundly moved. The Bishops took up the matter. First the Bishop of Oxford wrote to Newman that in his opinion the Tract was dangerous, and recommended that the series should be discontinued. In this recommendation Newman acquiesced, and the Tracts came to an end. Other Bishops followed. A special interest attaches to the utterance of Bishop Philpotts, of Exeter, whose uncompromising High Churchmanship had led a large section of the public to identify him with the Tractarian School. Yet in his Charge the following words occur, which are among the severest strictures ever passed upon the Tract: "The tone of the Tract as respects our own Church is offensive and indecent; as regards the Reformation and our Reformers absurd, as well as incongruous and unjust. Its principles of interpreting our Articles I cannot but deem most unsound; the reasoning with which it supports its principles sophistical; the averments on which it founds its reasoning at variance with recorded facts. It is far the most daring attempt ever yet made by a minister of the Church of England to neutralize the distinctive doctrines of our Church and make us symbolize with Rome."

But those who opposed or condemned the Tract were not the only persons who appreciated its tendency. Some of Newman's warmest supporters were equally clear-sighted. Among the younger Tractarians was a Fellow of Balliol named Ward, whose powers of logical reasoning, combined with great readiness of wit, had brought him into notice as one of the ablest men in the University. He had at first been a disciple of Arnold, but on perusing "Froude's Remains" was so struck by it that he determined to make

advances to the Tractarian School. This brought him under the fascination of Newman's influence, and he at once threw all the impulsive energy of a most ardent nature into the loyal devotion of discipleship. Ward hailed the Tract as an epoch-making document. He defended Newman's reasoning on every point; the only fault he allowed in it was that it did not go far enough. He pressed Newman to carry out the same principles of interpretation in other departments of the Church's formularies, and continually urged him to be more explicit in stating exactly what he believed. Newman had never quite trusted Ward, and was displeased at such persistent endeavours to force his hand. He withdrew more and more into seclusion. Though still retaining his benefice he resided mainly at Littlemore, in the society of one or two intimate companions, studying theology, corresponding with friends, or facing in solitude the perplexing questions that engrossed him. The coming change in his spiritual life already began to loom on the horizon. The presentiment had come upon him that he would not long be able to continue in our Church. At times he thought of retiring into lay communion. Meanwhile he withdrew from the guidance of the Movement, and left its direction mainly in the hands of Pusey, with whom he kept himself in almost daily correspondence.

During the next two or three years the interest of the history shifts from Newman to Pusey. It will be remembered that Pusey's chief contribution to the Tracts had been an Essay on Baptism, which had strongly enforced the doctrine of Regeneration in its loftiest form, and emphasized the early Christian teaching as to the extreme peril of post-baptismal sin. Those who are familiar with the literature of the primitive Church will remember the prolonged

controversy which gathered around the question of forgiveness of sin after Baptism. Some refused it altogether. A larger number allowed one restoration after public penitence. Only a few ventured to plead for a second reception to the Church's grace, and none for more. The consequence of this was that many persons put off their baptism till they thought they had outlived or escaped from temptations to carnal sin; and others deferred it till the hour of death, hoping that then, at any rate, there could be no danger of a relapse. It is ordinarily supposed that Infant Baptism was the rule in the early Church. It is difficult to be certain of the fact, because the writers of the period speak much more of the doctrine of baptism than of its practical use. Tertullian, writing about 200 years after Christ, advises a sparing administration of Infant Baptism, deeming it safer for *men* at any rate, to postpone the rite till early youth was past. But we know that Tertullian's rigorist views influenced him contrary to the general sense of the Church in many things, and probably also in this.

Still, the bare fact that such a theory of Baptism was possible shows how awful a mystery surrounded it in those times of primitive purity, and at the same time proves how easily reverence for a means of grace might turn into a superstitious worship of it.

Now Pusey's mind was steeped in the early Fathers. Moreover, his austere nature had a most utter horror of carnal frailty. Consequently, in depicting the supernatural grace of Baptism, he had seemed to many to dwell too much on its awfulness, and too little on its aspect of help and comfort.

Pusey set to work to correct this impression, not by detracting one jot from the claim of Baptism upon man's

regenerate life, but by putting side by side with it the power of the other Sacrament to restore the soul that has fallen from baptismal grace. He preached a sermon in the University pulpit in 1843, entitled "The Holy Eucharist a source of comfort to the Penitent." The doctrine of the sermon did not go at all beyond the language of the early Fathers and of our own greatest divines; but Pusey, guided by his own strong convictions, so marshalled his authorities that he appeared to several of his hearers to draw conclusions at variance with the accepted view of our Church's teaching on the subject of confession and absolution.

All Oxford was startled at hearing a few days afterwards that the sermon had been condemned by the Board of Divinity. I need not go into the rights or wrongs of the condemnation, for as the judges positively refused to hear Pusey in his own defence, their action is wholly destitute of judicial value. The sentence pronounced was that the sermon was unsound, and Pusey was suspended for two years from preaching before the University. This condemnation was a very foolish act. For Pusey was a dangerous man to meddle with. Not only had his holiness of life made him universally revered at Oxford, but his position gave him powerful friends. And many of the foremost Churchmen in England protested against the treatment he had received. Men of widely different views from himself felt that he had been unfairly dealt with. And one result of his suspension was the weakening of the authority of the heads of houses, and the first call for the dreaded remedy of University Reform. He himself made strong efforts to appeal to some higher court; but in those days the University authorities were virtually self-governing, and Pusey was advised by the best legal opinion that there

would be great difficulties in retrying the case. He therefore submitted, though under protest, and continued his labours so far as exclusion from the pulpit permitted.

Meanwhile a fresh complication had arisen, this time not in Oxford, but in high political circles of the Court. The King of Prussia, influenced by Bunsen, who was then ambassador at St. James', made overtures to the English Crown in the form of a proposal to found conjointly with our Government a Bishopric of Jerusalem, which was to be held alternately by a Bishop of the Anglican Church and a German Lutheran, the latter to receive Episcopal consecration from an English source. This was in 1842. From its first promulgation Newman had condemned the scheme. In his eyes it involved two radically false principles. In the first place, it committed our Church to joint spiritual action and intercommunion with the Lutheran body, which was Erastian in its discipline, and schismatic in its constitution, even if not actually heretical in doctrine. In the second place, it proposed to intrude a Bishop into a See which was already episcopally governed by a Prelate of the Eastern Church, and so violated the Canons of the Council of Nicæa.

Newman wrote to Pusey, expressing these views. Pusey had been at first inclined to approve the scheme, but eventually he came round to Newman's opinion, and opposed it. The protest of the High Church party was unavailing, as the Archbishop lent the measure his support, and in 1843 the Bishop was appointed. This Newman declares was one of the strongest influences which detached him from the English Church. The march of events justified Newman's attitude; for the plan proved unworkable, and on the resignation of the first Bishop, after a few years,

only one other appointment was made, which was again followed by an early resignation. At present there is an English Bishop in Jerusalem, Dr. Blyth, late of the Church Missionary staff. But he was appointed under quite different conditions. He is not Bishop of Jerusalem, but Bishop of the Anglican congregation in Jerusalem, a title which is in harmony with the precedents of the primitive Church, gives no offence to the Eastern Christians, and enables the Bishop to work in perfect harmony with other religious bodies.

We must now trace briefly the progress of the Movement under what may be called its junior development, the two foremost champions of which were Oakley and Ward. Oakley was a Tutor of Balliol, and intimate friend of Tait throughout his life. He was a man of very beautiful mind, fervent piety, and great sweetness of character. He left Oxford before 1840 for London, where he held the post of minister of St. Margaret's Chapel, and did much to spread the new Church principles among cultivated London society. Oakley alone among all the Tractarians possessed what we may call a craving for æsthetic worship. He was the first to concern himself with matters of ritual. He introduced several changes in the mode of conducting Divine Service, which alarmed Pusey. In 1840 he wrote an article in the *British Critic*, advocating a return to the more splendid ceremonial of the pre-Reformation period. Already he and Mr. Russell, of St. Peter's, Walworth, had given their attention to the now celebrated Ornaments Rubric, and had contended that the vestments were legal and ought to be restored. Pusey's attitude on this question is very instructive. He wrote to Oakley to this effect: "Anything that attracts notice from singularity is to be avoided. Gorgeous vestments ought not to be revived in

the present humiliation of our Church. The understanding of the Rubric is doubtful. If the Bishop disapproves, the vestments ought not to be used. The beauty of the Church's fabric and of the Altar should come first. Then painted windows, plate, and the like. Even the cross should be carefully used, and only as the real sign of a crucified life. Practice is the very condition of privilege. People may take up shreds and patches of the Catholic system without its realities, self-denial, reverence. Do not think that you are by their means teaching anything new. It is all in the Catechism and the Liturgy. Any act that has the party stamp should be avoided."

I believe that even to the end of his life, when the question of ritual had overshadowed all others, Pusey still retained the same unwillingness to encourage it. Partly, no doubt, this arose from the cast of his mind, which was concerned entirely with doctrine and the inner life, and shrunk with English reserve from any display of enthusiasm or ceremonial beyond what accurately conveyed the inward feelings of the heart. But we may discern another cause for his want of sympathy with ritualistic splendour. He regarded our Church as suffering humiliation, as heavily chastened for her sins, and therefore not in a suitable position to assume the trappings of victory. To Pusey the fact that Latitudinarian views about the Trinity and other mysteries of the faith were tolerated in our Church was a deep reproach to our Christianity. The ruined fabrics, the laxity of discipline, the disuse of daily service, the rarity of Holy Communion, the neglect of spiritual ministrations, which were then so common, seemed to him to be crying evils which called for a Church in sackcloth and ashes, and made gorgeous ritual an unreality if not a mockery. And this

feeling, branded into his mind in these early years, he never quite shook off, though there was much reason afterwards why he might have done so.

If Oakley's bent was towards symbolism and outward reverence, that of W. G. Ward was towards the hardest, boldest, most thorough-going logic. We owe to the filial piety of his gifted son a very full account of this singular character, whose pre-eminence in intellect gave him a greater influence at Oxford than perhaps he would have obtained on the more varied stage of London life. He is best known to Churchmen by his book called "The Ideal of a Christian Church," which was published in 1844, but he had come into notice four years previously by his defence of Tract 90, already alluded to. In defending Newman he had gone far beyond Newman himself. He willingly admitted that the Articles were Protestant in spirit, but this did not prevent him from subscribing them in a Catholic sense. "I am doing no more," he retorts in effect upon his opponents, "than the Low Church and Broad Church do when they read the Service of Baptism or when they receive Holy Orders." As long as our formularies are imposed upon men of different and, indeed, opposing views, one side or the other must subscribe some of the tests in a non-natural sense. "For myself," he said, "I subscribed the Eleventh Article in a non-natural sense, and I am willing to do so again. No one can prevent my holding the whole cycle of Roman doctrine while remaining a priest of the Church of England, just as no one can prevent others from holding the whole cycle of Calvinist or Socinian doctrine while still professing to be bound by the same formularies."

It will be seen that Ward's argument is of the nature of a retort, what logicians call an "argumentum ad hominem."

It comes to this, "Why can you not leave me liberty to do what you claim the liberty of doing yourself? If *you* may be a Calvinist, Lutheran, or Socinian in all but the name, why may not I be a Roman?" If I am correct in putting this line of reasoning into Ward's mouth, which I believe I am, you will see that his argument is academical rather than practical, that of the logician bent on discomfiting his opponent rather than that of the anxious inquirer seeking to be guided into truth. Ward was himself a man of unquestionable sincerity, devoid of the fear of man, and fully prepared to accept the consequences of his acts. Even those who most strongly disapproved of his methods, could not but admire his unflinching courage and generosity of heart. Yet there can be no doubt that the part he took at this time proved injurious to the fortunes of the Movement. He concerned himself but little with historical studies, and not at all with popular religious prejudice. His object was always to press every admission of an opponent to the utmost, to drive every argument to its extreme conclusion.

While Newman and Pusey really believed that the Articles did not intend to disown Catholic truth or to enforce Protestant opinions, except in condemnation of Roman abuses, Ward seems to have thought it quite immaterial whether the Articles did or did not hold with Catholic tradition. The question for him was, Can they *now* be used to deny it? This question he answered triumphantly in the negative. If, he argues, I can hold, as I make no secret of holding, every Roman doctrine, why am I left in undisputed possession of my post in the English Church? Consequently, he believed that until such time as the authorities of our Church should decide otherwise he was entitled to attach to the Articles a distinctly Catholic

meaning, whether the words appeared to admit it or not.

The position thus indicated he shortly afterwards developed in a still bolder form. In 1843 Mr. William Palmer had written a severe pamphlet,¹ accusing the Tractarian School of trying to Romanize our Church, and defending his charges by quotations from the works more especially of Newman and Ward. Ward determined to reply. But his projected pamphlet grew into a ponderous treatise of 600 pages, which was published in 1844, under the title, "The Ideal of a Christian Church." This work, which I suppose no one now thinks of reading, created a perfect storm of passionate feeling when issued. Its ability was great; its thoroughness unquestionable; its boldness attractive; and its conclusions, to say the least, remarkable. There are two main ideas in the book. The first is its violent opposition to Luther's doctrine of justification, which it declares to be worse than atheism, and the cause of nearly all the defects of English Christianity. I need not go into his reasons. It is sufficient to say that Ward's mind was altogether unhistorical. What he attacked was not the real, practical belief of the Evangelical Church, or of Luther himself, but the system which his logic discovered to be the necessary outcome of Luther's words. No doubt there are many expressions of Luther's which are highly reprehensible, and perhaps almost blasphemous, if taken by themselves; but they are paradoxes or violent outbursts of controversial feeling, and not deliberate dogmatic statements, meant to stand the test of cross-examination. Those of us who believe that justification by faith is the teaching of the

¹ This pamphlet was reprinted in 1883, and incorporated into a longer work, entitled "A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of Tracts for the Times," with an introduction and supplement extending to the present time, published by Rivingtons.

great Apostle, will not be dislodged from their adherence to it by any imperfections of temper or of statement in Luther or anyone else. But Ward evidently did not believe the doctrine. He founded religion on moral fitness to receive it, on the testimony of a pure conscience. And the development of this principle is the second idea of his book. The question arises, How is moral fitness for religion to be produced? how is a pure conscience to be created? And his answer is practically by a comprehensive standard or ideal of holiness inculcated by a sufficient authority. This authority and this ideal are both found, and found only, in the Catholic Church. The Church is at once the type of holiness and the means of it. It is in every way the opposite of the world. It gives man the only knowledge he can ever have of God's will and of his own destiny. Mere human reasoning has no part whatever in this ideal. All the virtues and graces of the Church are supernatural, communicated to man through the Sacraments. He proceeds to enumerate the signs or notes of this supernatural holiness, and in every one of them he finds that the Church of Rome stands the test while our own Church fails. Happily for us, he thinks, we need not leave the Church of England on this account, for there is room for every Roman doctrine in our communion. "We find, oh! most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight! we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen. Three years have passed since I said plainly that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine, yet I retain my fellowship, which I hold on the tenure of subscription, and have received no ecclesiastical censure in any shape."

Such a challenge as this could not be expected to go

unanswered. The heads of houses met, and gave notice that in February, 1845, they would bring three important resolutions before the University—(1) that Mr. Ward's book be condemned; (2) that Mr. Ward be deprived of all his University degrees, and reduced to the position of an undergraduate; and (3) that the University authorities should have the power of requiring at any time subscription to the Articles in the sense in which they themselves, as representing the University, imposed them.

This notice was issued in December, and once again the whole University, resident and non-resident, was convulsed by the bitterness of theological strife. But an unexpected result happened. While most Churchmen, even including Ward's friends, were in favour of condemning his book, and a considerable number were willing also to consent to his degradation, a widespread and powerful opposition was at once aroused against the third resolution, which appeared to be, and indeed was, the imposition of a new test. Even the party most hostile to the Tracts, that containing Arnold, Stanley, and Tait, was uncompromising in its antagonism to such a course. Great statesmen, judges, and lawyers united with Churchmen in reprobating what they justly held to be an odious and tyrannical act. So general was the indignation that even the heads of houses were moved by it. Shortly before the day arrived they announced that the third resolution was withdrawn. Yet in their infatuated blindness to the tone of public opinion they actually gave notice of another resolution, condemning the principles of Tract 90, thus making Ward's case an excuse for wounding Newman, though he had long retired from the scene, and was known to be likely at any moment to secede from the Church.

The eventful day arrived, ushered in by a piercing wind, with sleet and snow. The theatre was crowded to suffocation. The rulers of the University took their seats. According to the statutes, all proceedings had to be conducted in the Latin tongue. But an exception was made in favour of Mr. Ward, who was allowed to make his defence in English. He spoke, as all his hearers acknowledged, with signal ability, for more than two hours. However, the vote against his book was carried by an overwhelming majority, and his own degradation by a smaller though still considerable one. But when the motion against Tract 90 was put, the Proctors, Mr. Guillemard and Mr. Church (afterwards Dean of St. Paul's and historian of the Movement) came forward and interposed their veto, which, by an old custom of the University, puts a stop to further proceedings. This determined action was cordially approved of by all but a small minority. The result of the contest was practically to close the history of the Movement in Oxford.

Hardly had the din of battle subsided when Mr. Ward announced that he had been received into the Roman Communion. He was accompanied or followed by Oakley, Dalgairns, and others of less note. In October of the same year came the anxiously expected termination of Newman's long conflict. He also was received, by Father Dominic the Passionist, into the Roman Catholic Church. Of his secession it was remarked by a great statesman, thirty years after it occurred, that it had struck a blow at the English Church from which she still reeled. If this could be said with any semblance of truth a generation after the event, well might his contemporaries believe such a disaster to be all but irretrievable! Well might those who loved the Church of England tremble for her future! Well might they be

excused for doubting whether she were able to weather such a storm !

The event proved that all these misgivings were groundless. Keble and Pusey never for a moment wavered in their allegiance to the Church of their birth. The great body of the Oxford School stood firm. Not more than fifty clergymen, out of more than 19,000, followed Newman to Rome. It is true this number included names pre-eminent for personal holiness and devotion to work. These carried into their new communion, not only the spiritual graces and trained intelligence of England's best Churchmanship, but also a knowledge of our position from the inside, and in especial of its weak points, which gave them a great advantage in the controversies in which they soon engaged. It is only fair to our Church to remark that Rome owes to us a very large proportion of her ablest champions in this country, both in the field of argument and in the work of proselytizing. She has received from our ranks accessions of learning, of wealth, of social influence, of the choicest piety, which have unquestionably done much to extend her prestige. Moreover, the exigencies of political strife have called forth a disposition among successive Governments to conciliate, if not to favour, the Roman Catholic interest, a disposition which the Roman authorities have known how to utilize to the full. If ever a Church had a fair field for winning converts, the Church of Rome has had it in England.

But this is a digression. I wish to conclude this Lecture with a brief comment on Newman's change of faith as contrasted with the steadfastness under the same influences of such men as Keble and Pusey.

We may at once dismiss all explanations of an uncharitable or depreciatory character either towards Newman or towards

his opponents. To say, for instance, that Newman was "hounded out of the Church" is absolutely untrue. He himself assures us that the force which drove him out of Anglicanism was not from without but from within. No one who reads the *Apologia* can have any doubt on this point. Again, to say that Newman's intellect was strong, but his judgment weak, is to say what is extremely difficult to prove. For my own part, I can detect no inferiority in Newman's judgment to that of Pusey or Keble, except on that very point which is the one we want to explain, viz., his inferior loyalty to the Church of England. Others, again, there are who believe him to have been a Romanist at heart from the first, and to have for many years used language against Rome and in favour of Anglicanism which he did not believe, simply to gain time for maturing his design of unprotestantizing our Church. This view of his conduct, however politely it may be expressed, makes him out a traitor. And I utterly refuse to believe that any impartial person who reads his correspondence, and tries to follow the progress of his mind, will ever be found to endorse it. The only tenable explanation is that Newman was constrained by the logical result of the principles he espoused, much against his will, and for a long time without being aware of it, to drift steadily Romewards. I do not mean to imply that his attitude during the period of hesitation was perfectly straightforward. The simultaneous expression of two sets of opinions, one in his public utterances, the other in his private correspondence, though it can be explained by his desire to put into an objective form the two counter-influences which distracted his mind, gives some colour to the strictures passed upon him by the opponents of the Movement. There seems good ground for believing that

his character had two serious flaws in it. One I have already referred to, and have ventured to describe as egoism, a sort of *amour-propre*, which led him to treat our Church as he thought she had treated him, and so to reconcile himself too readily to despairing of her. This feeling comes out in that mournful and touchingly pathetic discourse which he delivered from the pulpit of Littlemore as his farewell sermon, and which we are told few of those who were present heard without tears.

The second defect was the result of his unparalleled subtlety of intellect, and that tendency to casuistry or fine moral distinctions, which to most Englishmen looks like a defective sense of truth. But these faults, supposing them to have existed, would only affect our judgment on his moral character, not on the soundness of his reasonings. To my thinking, Newman is undisputably the most intellectual man and the clearest reasoner of all the party of the Movement. No one could equal him in drawing a conclusion from his premisses. Consequently, the mere fact that this gifted man felt driven by the irresistible force of reasoning, against his will and against his interest, into the Church of Rome is a very strong argument that his course was right.

He declares most positively that the Church of Rome gave him perfect peace, that he was never troubled by any further doubt or misgiving, and that he wished it were possible to make his old friends who had remained behind understand the comfort of soul he now enjoyed. Do I imply, then, that the whole Movement was really, as its enemies said, a Romeward Movement, and that all who were honest enough, or clear-sighted enough, to act up to their principles, ought to have followed Newman? By no

means. I believe the Movement was from the first two-fold—that it contained two different principles, which for a long time were confused together, and only very gradually came to be distinguished as not merely separable but diverse. What Newman was seeking for from the very first was an infallible guide, some visible authority on this earth which could claim to rule his conscience.

And, if I may express my individual opinion, the only Church that professes to give this guidance is the Church of Rome. Newman betrayed a craving for such guidance long before he had any thoughts of leaving our Church, when he wrote, after some words of his Bishop which he thought unfavourable to him, "He was my Pope." A man whose mind thus instinctively revealed its bent was already in spirit a Romanist. Pusey tells an interesting story how Newman said to him in 1845, "O Pusey; I have leaned upon the Bishops, and they have failed me." Pusey adds, "I thought as he spoke, 'I at any rate have never leant upon the Bishops. I have always leant upon the Church of England.'"

This is the real difference between the two men. To Pusey the Church of England represented Apostolical Christianity. To him its Catholic character was not an open question at all. It was the most certain thing about it. What he had to do was to prove this to those who unhappily doubted or denied it. If in doing this he went perilously near to adopting the methods of Rome, and sanctioning some points of its teaching which our Church had rejected, he nevertheless remained firm in his original conviction, and it is for his unshaken steadfastness in this conviction, through evil report and good report, that we honour his memory, even though some of us may strongly

disapprove of many features of his system. Newman's problem was, "How am I to be sure that I am safe?" He worked this out, and the answer came "Rome." Pusey's problem was, "How am I, being sure of the safety of my own position, to make others who feel the same anxiety that Newman feels, see that all they need is already theirs in their own Church?" Newman could see no sure alternative between absolute scepticism and an infallible Church. Pusey, whose horror of scepticism was even greater than Newman's, felt that English infidelity must be combated by England's Christianity, and that the primitive faith, as held by our Church, was the best and strongest safeguard against the assaults of modern as formerly of ancient unbelief.

The great power of Rome lies in her adaptability to the successive cravings of the human spirit. Under the outward profession of unchanging dogma she is really in a perpetual flux. This Newman afterwards justified in his *Essay on Development and Grammar of Assent*. English theology keeps to the old lines. If any modern doctrines have been introduced into our system, it was done by inadvertence or error, and, according to Pusey, the Church must be purged of these elements, and revert to the original Apostolic system, including those parts of it which are most repugnant to modern ideas, and most difficult to revive from long and general disuse. Hence Pusey remained when Newman departed. He was not in the least shaken by his friend's defection. He only mourned over it as one of God's judgments upon our Church.

In proceeding to sketch briefly the subsequent history of the Movement in the wider field of the country at large, I shall keep in the foreground the principle that Pusey contended for, that is, Given the Church of England

as the form of Apostolical Christianity for this land, how is it to be brought back again to the full richness of its original heritage, and to recover those elements of discipline and piety which the long Protestant ascendancy has obscured?

LECTURE IV.

The Movement in the Church at Large.

WE have now traced the history of the Oxford Movement from its commencement to its close so far as Oxford is concerned. In respect of its main object it had been a failure. So far had it been from stamping its character upon the religious teaching of the University that the most influential officials were more opposed to it than ever. The march of Liberalism, which Newman had hoped to stem, advanced with quickened pace, and soon carried all before it in the University.

I have already remarked on the frequent generation of ideas in Oxford which afterwards take hold on the country at large. This was true of Anglo-Catholicism, it was also true of the Liberalism which succeeded to it.

Now the secret of the early Tractarians' influence was the transparent purity of their motives and self-denial of their lives. Their doctrines might be right or wrong, but there was no mistaking the whole-heartedness with which they held them. Englishmen always think more of the evidence of a man's life than of his creed. And such lives as those of Newman, Pusey, Williams, and their friends, roused the eager enthusiasm of young men, full of generous impulses,

asking to be led, not to wealth or pleasure, but to the stern self-sacrifice of the service of humanity. In these men they found the guides they sought: men holier, purer, greater than themselves: and what wonder if they followed them perhaps too blindly?

To such a mighty attraction as this the old Liberals could oppose nothing that could compete with it for a moment. The sensational philosophy of Mill, which was gradually winning its dominion over English thought, was not calculated to arouse moral enthusiasm. The leading Liberals were conspicuous for their chilling superiority of demeanour, their lofty contempt of the unintellectual, and their hard unsympathetic temper. Whateley, Hampden, and to some extent, Hawkins, are types of what I mean. But when Arnold went to Rugby he set himself to create a new School of Liberals, men who should take life in grim earnest, should regard comfort as incompatible with duty, should be unworldly in the real sense, that is, should make it the first object of their lives to help forward the moral and intellectual enfranchisement of their fellow-men, utterly indifferent whether their own career were counted a success or a failure. The young men he sent year after year to Oxford came fired with these ideas. To them Arnold represented the highest pinnacle of human virtue. The University Professors and Tutors could never produce in their hearts such a sentiment of reverential discipleship as their Headmaster had won in their most impressionable years. Consequently, Arnoldism soon became a force in Oxford. When Stanley, its most brilliant though not its truest representative, came to Balliol, he was at once able to take a commanding position, and to hold up the standard of a new and nobler Liberal creed.

This was the school of thought which profited most by the collapse of the Oxford Movement. For some ten years it filled the vacant place of inspirer of moral enthusiasm, and with what success may be judged by the University Commission of 1855, which laid down the lines of Reform on a liberal basis, and whose initiative has been followed by all subsequent legislation, by Parliament as well as within the University itself.

All the principles that Newman so keenly fought for have been surrendered. The University is practically secularized. No offices are confined to Churchmen, except those of the Divinity School; though, on the other hand, there are no clerical disabilities. But the organic connection between the Church and the University has been rudely shaken, though, happily, not entirely severed. If, then, the Church is to issue from Oxford as strong in the future as in the past it will be from the power of her inward life, not from any outward advantages, for there are none left. Never was reorganization more complete. Old names are continued, old customs observed; but the spirit of Reformed Oxford since 1860 is as different from that of 1833, when the Movement began, as if the two epochs had been three hundred instead of thirty years apart. At the same time, though outwardly defeated, the great principles of the Movement settled down into the spiritual inheritance of the place; and with Pusey and J. B. Mozley as their interpreters, no one could say that they had sunk into obscurity.

But it is time to take a larger view of the question. Oxford is no longer the true centre of interest. She has done her part; she has sown the seed. We must not forget that the field is the world, the great world of ordinary men

and women. Henceforth the development of the Movement is to be watched, not in academical discussion, not in theological treatises, but in the pulpit, on the platform, in Parliament, in the architect's study, in a thousand parishes through the length and breadth of the land.

From the very first the Tractarian leaders had been in constant touch with High Churchmen everywhere, who looked to them to lay down the lines of policy, which they were prepared in their smaller spheres to carry out. Palmer, an unexceptionable witness, speaks of the very large number of rural clergy who took their Church views from the *British Magazine* and *British Critic*. There can be no doubt of the great and steadily growing influence of Tractarian ideas until the increasing tendency towards Rome began to alarm the readers of the *British Critic*. But by that time some of the chief principles were firmly established. The necessity for Church restoration, for reverent services, for the weekly Eucharist, for the daily office, for pastoral ministrations as well as mere friendly visits, for the offertory as part of divine worship, for the observance of fast-days and generally of the Rubrics and the Calendar—all these had by the time of Newman's secession been instilled with great success into the minds of a vast number both of clergy and laity. And it must be remembered that every year the loftiest and most earnest spirits of Oxford were receiving Holy Orders in different dioceses, and carrying with them reminiscences of Newman's and Pusey's words, as well as referring to the men themselves in all matters of difficulty and doubt. Pusey, in one of his letters, defends himself against the charge of seeking to be a director of consciences. He declares that the office was thrust upon him simply by the daily influx of requests

for his spiritual advice. In a time of storm and stress it cannot be expected that the rank and file should rely on their own judgment. They must have recourse to some master-mind from whom to take their orders. Those who amid the thickening perplexities of 1843 and the years that followed needed a strong guide found him in Pusey. There can be no doubt that such work was highly congenial to him. He was, as I have remarked, by nature well fitted to rule. And his industry was as indefatigable as his power of entering into another's conscience was remarkable. The number of letters of advice (most of them unquestioningly obeyed) which he wrote every day, in addition to his public labours, will never be known. But I believe it to have been enormous. When attending his lectures in 1868, 1869, and again in 1871, I was often present when the post came in, and the pile of correspondence, which he would lay with a sigh on a little table near him, suggested by itself a hard day's work. I cannot doubt that in this way for nearly forty years he exerted a private but most powerful and widespread influence over no inconsiderable proportion of the Church-people of England.

The Oxford following, however, was confined mainly to three classes in the country. First, to the more earnest of the parochial clergy; secondly, to a considerable number of eminent public men, who had as a rule been educated at Oxford—such as Gladstone, Coleridge, Roundell Palmer, Hope Scott, Page Wood, Beresford Hope, and Heathcote, together with a fair sprinkling of professional men, especially the great Church architects, who saw in the Oxford principles a magnificent field for the exercise of their special gifts. Thirdly, the Movement profoundly affected religiously-

minded ladies in the higher circles of society. I question whether among all its results the greatest is not the re-establishment of female spiritual work on the basis of religious communities. But this will be discussed more fully afterwards. I now merely advert to it to show how deeply the Oxford ideas had taken hold of three sections of society, each in its respective sphere, exercising a most potent influence.

From the first they found a powerful and earnest supporter in Mr. Gladstone. The lives of Dr. Pusey, Bishop Wilberforce, and Cardinal Manning afford abundant evidence of the profound interest he felt in the progress of the Movement, and how ready he was, even amid the most absorbing cares of State, to give his best thoughts to the consideration of every difficulty, and to help by his powerful advocacy what he believed to be the highest interests of the Church. The Church of England owes a heavy debt of gratitude to this illustrious Statesman for helping to steer her course through many a shoal and breaker, and especially in the earlier days, when his political entanglements were not so embarrassing, and when his ecclesiastical correspondents were friends and equals to whom he could speak without fear of being misunderstood, and who on their side could approach him without consciousness of any parting of the ways.

Gladstone must always be identified with the Oxford School. But he was only the ablest and most conspicuous of a considerable number of public men, whose adherence supplied the element of masculine intellect and disciplined judgment, which the ecclesiastical and academical mind so often lacks.

It will be observed that I do not include any of the Bishops among the party of the Movement. Bishop Bagot,

of Oxford, was considered a High Churchman, and he most sincerely tried to enter into the mind of Newman, as Newman himself testifies, with truly Christian sympathy and noble generosity of heart. But his abilities were not equal to grappling with the subtle intellects of the Oxford leaders, and it was a great relief to him when the vacancy of the See of Gloucester enabled him to quit a field to which his power of generalship was inadequate. Blomfield, of London, in some respects the foremost man on the Bench, was also a High Churchman. But he had no taste for theology, and was more than fully occupied with the tremendous practical problems that pressed for settlement in London. Thus, though he more than once gave his countenance to the Oxford party, he did not really go with their views, and on the crucial question of the Jerusalem Bishopric was opposed to them. Archbishop Howley was perhaps more disposed to sympathize. But Pusey, whose friend and pupil Harrison, one of the original Tract writers, became the Archbishop's chaplain, was greatly disappointed at his failure to bring the Archbishop into more general accordance with his views. There remained the Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Philpotts, whose Churchmanship was of the most uncompromising type, and to whom the Oxford party confidently looked for something more than sympathy, for active support. This, however, the Bishop only gave up to a certain point. When Tract 90 appeared he took a very decided line of condemnation, and entirely disavowed all connection with those who defended it. Thus it may be said that the whole Bench of Bishops stood aloof, for the others were mostly Evangelical or Latitudinarian appointments, who would naturally be opposed to it.

I ought perhaps before describing the men who translated the Oxford Movement into a *national* movement to mention the celebrated Gorham case, which occurred, indeed at a later date, but is connected in character with these disastrous defeats of High Church principles which I have already recorded. In the year 1849 Bishop Philpotts of Exeter refused to institute the Rev. J. C. Gorham to a living within his diocese on the ground that he publicly denied the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration taught in the Prayer Book. Mr. Gorham had recourse to the Court of Arches, which decided against him. He then appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which reversed the decision of the lower Court, and held that the Bishop was bound to institute. This decision came as a shock to the Church party. The Bishop was so confident of the strength of his position that he refused to accept the judgment. He not only persisted in refusing to institute Mr. Gorham, but he declared that he would renounce communion with any prelate, even the Archbishop, who should consent to do so. The Archbishop, who had been one of the majority on the Judicial Committee, instituted Mr. Gorham, and Bishop Philpotts renounced communion with him as he had threatened.

One result of this judgment was the secession of Arch-deacon Manning to the Roman Church. Certain other clergymen of note followed him, among whom was Arch-deacon R. Wilberforce, and one of my predecessors at Kibworth, the Rev. S. Bathurst, who I believe still survives, the one solitary relic of what we may call the heroic age of secessions.

The Gorham judgment is regarded by many Churchmen

as the most disastrous event in recent Church history. They represent it as the over-riding by a secular court of a spiritual obligation. They consider it to decide that a minister of the Church of England need not teach the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, though that doctrine is explicitly laid down in the Prayer Book. If this were really its purport, Churchmen would have an undoubted ground, not only of complaint, but of opposition.

So far, however, as I understand the point at issue, this is not what the judgment affirms. A lay court cannot pronounce on the soundness or unsoundness of any clergyman's doctrine, but only on the question whether any expression or act which can be proved to have been said or done by him is or is not legally compatible with the terms of the formulary by which he is bound.

The way in which the Bishop brought the charge was partly responsible for the result of the judgment. The Court complained that by the course he had thought fit to adopt he had made it impossible for them to try the case on strictly legal principles. They were compelled to ask Mr. Gorham to state in exact language what was his interpretation of the Baptismal Service. And the answer he made was such that the Judges did not think it possible to convict him. They therefore decided to give him the benefit of the doubt.

But in doing this they were not deciding that Baptismal Regeneration was an indifferent matter, which might be affirmed or denied with equal security in the Church of England. On this point they pronounced no opinion. They merely declared that Mr. Gorham's particular interpretation could not be condemned.

It is always difficult for lawyers and theologians to understand one another's methods. The lay judge resolutely keeps out of sight the question of truth or falsehood of doctrine, which is the one thing the theologian cares about. He confines his attention solely to the question what legal interpretation the given words will bear, and whether the words or actions of the accused party are reasonably compatible with such interpretation. Consequently, Manning went too far in concluding that the Church of England was committed to the toleration of heresy. Pusey disapproved of the judgment as much as Manning, but he saw more clearly the limits of its application.

This case is important as being the first of a long series of judgments delivered by the Privy Council in the disputes about doctrine and ritual, which have resulted in widespread dissatisfaction among the High Church party with the existing Court of Appeal. At first their attitude was different. Pusey had more than once expressed a desire to have the questions between him and the Heads of Houses brought before the Courts. So confident was he of establishing his contention that he evinced keen disappointment at the failure of his attempts for a trial. Even when a discussion arose between himself and his Bishop he urgently pressed for a legal hearing, offering to bear the expense of it himself, as the only satisfactory method of ascertaining what the Church really taught.

It was the unfavourable result of this, their first test-case, which opened the eyes of many High Churchmen to the unsatisfactory character of the highest ecclesiastical tribunal. As Sir R. Phillimore, the Dean of Arches, admitted, what Bishop Philpotts and those who sided with him really desired

was to expel the party who explained away the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration from the Church. Then, as now, the lay tribunal was the chief security for the Church's comprehensiveness. Theologians, by the very necessity of their opinions, cannot be tolerant. Each party in turn, so soon as it becomes dominant, is impelled by an irresistible impulse to reject opinions which clash with its view of the true faith. If the inclusion of the three historic parties in our Church is really worth retaining, if it is in truth essential to an Established Church, then the only security for maintaining it is a Supreme Court, whose decisions are guided by legal and not by ecclesiastical considerations. We shall recur to this subject again in our last lecture.

The secession of Archdeacon Manning was the last serious blow on the side of Romanism. It concludes the first and disastrous chapter of the Movement. Since that time no first-rate leader of our religious thought has lapsed to Rome. Threats have indeed been uttered more than once by eminent divines that, in the event of certain decisions being given, or certain measures passed, they might be compelled to seek a refuge in another communion. But happily the circumstances contemplated have not arisen, and the Church has been saved from so perilous a strain.

Nor does it seem likely that any future leader will carry with him a more influential Church following than such men as Newman, Manning, and Pusey. Hence we may perhaps regard the attractive force of Romanism over the highest spiritual minds of our Church as having reached its zenith about forty-five years ago, and since then showing a tendency, though a gradual one, to decline. It has no longer the force of novelty, nor the advocacy of such power-

ful characters. It was then a perplexing, incalculable phenomenon. It has become a familiar institution, like the other forms of religious dissent.

We are now in a position briefly to review the work of the great practical pioneers of Catholic Churchmanship in the country at large. This work of theirs is directly connected with the Movement, though some of its developments have gone into other channels, and some have been actually opposed to the original Oxford principles. I will connect my illustrations with three familiar names, one in a great manufacturing city; one in a country parish, half town, half village; and one on an episcopal throne, and in the centre of the national life. The three names are those of Dr. Hook, Mr. Butler of Wantage, and Bishop Samuel Wilberforce. I hardly like to omit so well known a name as that of George Anthony Denison, the militant Archdeacon of Taunton, the champion of unbending Toryism and uncompromising Churchmanship in Convocation and on public platforms. But I think that Mr. Butler is on the whole a more all-round example of the power of the Movement, and all the more striking because he was a Cambridge man working in the diocese of Oxford.

With this passing tribute to the character of a noble-hearted if somewhat intolerant champion of the Oxford School, I proceed to say a few words about my three selected types.

It should be stated that Hook, whom I am first to mention, began his clerical career before the period of the Movement, and had already arrived at mature years before he was brought into close connection with its leaders. But their influence upon him, and in particular that of Pusey,

was so deep and lasting that, though he cannot justly be called a disciple, he affords a pre-eminent example of what the Movement was able to effect on an independent-minded High Churchman brought into contact with it.

Among all the Churchmen of this century there is not one who is at once more masculine and more original than Walter Farquhar Hook. Sprung, like so many of our foremost men, from the country gentry, educated in the severest discipline of our public school life, himself a magnificent specimen of the typical Englishman, burly, genial, outspoken, strong in his likes and dislikes, a born fighter, delighting in giving and taking hard blows : yet withal the kindest and tenderest hearted of men, without one grain of malice or ill-will, simple as the day, though fancying himself a highly astute diplomatist : passionate, impulsive, masterful, ill-brooking the slightest opposition, and often decidedly unjust, yet always atoning for his fault by the most sincere repentance, always ready to make amends by the amplest apology : gifted with a strong, healthy brain, which took at once a firm grasp of principle, and was able to pilot it safe through all manner of apparent inconsistencies, and to erect it in triumph at last on the enemy's stronghold : lacking, it may be, in delicacy of spirit, in theological learning, and in refinement of sympathies, but straightforward and honest to the core, and bold with a courage nothing could daunt. Such was the man to whom God's Providence assigned the momentous task of planting the revived Churchmanship in the huge, neglected, uneducated, but wealthy and prosperous, city of Leeds (1837). Never did workman gird himself more manfully to his task. He found the great manufacturing town indifferent if not hostile to the Church. He left it one of

the chief strongholds of loyal Churchmanship: and his work has outlived him: for to this day there is no city in England in which the Church is stronger, more popular, and more intelligently served than in the Yorkshire capital.

The difficulties of the Church in the North of England were enormous. In the early days of the century the bitterness of feeling between masters and men was such as happily we can now realize only through the literature that describes it. The hateful doctrines of Political Economy reigned supreme. Man was regarded as created solely for the purpose of producing wealth. Unrestricted competition was the Gospel of human life. Interference by Government with the grasping methods of amassing wealth was regarded with anger, and often resisted with success. The life of the operatives differed in little but the name from that of slaves. Women and children, as being the most defenceless, were ground to the dust by severe and protracted labour. Health, decency, and morality were alike impossible. Comfort, refinement, and education were Utopian ideas, not meant for the sons and daughters of toil. Small wonder that the down-trodden masses groaned in sullen indignation, and while they vented their sense of injustice in ignorant agitations and ferocious outbreaks, were disposed to regard the Church and its ministers with angry mistrust, as part of the machinery of legalized oppression, which the upper classes know so well how to handle in order to keep down the poor.

Hook, with the quick intuition of genius, discerned the situation. At Holy Trinity, Coventry, where he had worked as Vicar for several years, he had perceived that the new Churchmanship must capture the towns if it meant to get

any hold over the national life. Rural England had once been the strength of the nation. A new era had dawned. Henceforth English civilization was to be transferred to the towns. The Church must begin at once the same work in them that it had carried on for two hundred years in the country. But though it was the same work, its methods must be new. The town population was essentially a democracy. The social superiority that counted for so much in village life was a hindrance rather than a help in these huge centres. The Church must no longer pose as the Church of the noble, the rich, the genteel. She must go back to her origin. She must rest her claim on her spiritual character as the Divine proclaimer of human salvation. And she must show that she meant this by going straight to the homes of the poor, and helping them to better their outward circumstances, and so leading them on to trust her in her higher message.

I do not for a moment mean to imply that good and earnest men before Hook had not approached their work in this spirit. Unquestionably there were many such. But they had not Hook's opportunity nor Hook's strength. To him must be given the credit of inaugurating the modern conception of the advanced Churchman's standard of town work. All that is sound and durable in it follows from Hook's principles. What he demanded for the Church was a fair field. On his part he dropped the aristocratic props, the social privileges, the use of his income for his own needs : he lived among the people and for the people, and gave himself and his fortune for their good. On their part he claimed that they should drop their prejudices, forget the past, and take, like brothers and sisters, the hand that he as Christ's

ambassador held out to them, to improve their life in this world and to bring them back to their hopes for another. But in this picture of Hook's ideal we must not imagine there was the slightest tinge of liberalism, still less of socialism. Hook was the gentleman quite as much as the Churchman, and the methods of Dissent were even more odious to him than its doctrines. He was really uncompromising in his demands for submission to Church authority and surrender of private judgment. It is amusing to see from his correspondence how he wavered between the ideal Churchmanship which Pusey wished him to enforce and the less perfect alternatives which alone practical life permits, and which he well knew must receive their final justification at the hands of common-sense. Hook when in Pusey's presence was under the spell of his genius : but when he found himself once more at Leeds he was fain to excuse himself for apparent lukewarmness, for he found it impossible to rise to the height of Pusey's views without mystifying if not frightening the people, who were just beginning to think the Church might do them some good. After the troubles of 1845 Hook became more guarded in his advocacy of the Tractarian views : and gradually settled into a type of Churchmanship more like that of his early days, such as was that of Keble's father, sober, temperate, and consistent, but not innovating or revolutionary.

In estimating Hook's work, we must remember that all the intelligence of our nation is now concentrated in the great towns, one may say in a few of them. For them life is ruled by business principles, and in public questions by party organization. If the Church is to take hold of this life, it must have a concrete shape, a business-like character,

an organization of its own. And this involves a set of principles—what we may call a programme. This the Oxford Movement supplied; therein surpassing the old Evangelical party in its adaptation to modern needs. The form which this programme took was the restoration of the externals of religion. It included the building and restoring of Churches, and the formation of fresh parishes, the revival of disused services, the building of schools, and, most urgent of all, the carrying out of Divine worship on the strict lines of the Prayer Book. Hook set an example which has been followed and improved upon, not only by his own section of the clergy, but by many of the most earnest Evangelicals, who have moved with the times and engrafted on their system of individual conversion the emblems of a widely different school of thought, thereby undoubtedly strengthening their own popularity and removing some grave causes of misconception.

We turn now to watch the Movement at work in a country district. We select the parish of Wantage in Berkshire, a small isolated townlet of about three thousand souls, known to students of English History as the birthplace of King Alfred and of Bishop Butler. For some generations the living had been held by non-resident Incumbents, who had been contented to appear twice a year to collect their tithes, and had left the cure of souls in the hands of stipendiary Curates. As in Leeds, so in Wantage, Dissent had stepped in where the Church had failed to do her duty. Nevertheless, the old principle of loyalty to the Church was by no means extinguished. All it needed to kindle it into a new and vigorous life was a loving, earnest guidance, that should combine definite dogmatic teaching with practical wisdom

and patient sympathy. This was supplied by the appointment of William John Butler in 1846. Educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge, he was ordained in 1842 to the curacy of Dogmersfield, Hants, the Vicar, Mr. Charles Dyson, being an Oxford contemporary and intimate friend of his neighbour, John Keble, Vicar of Hursley. To this circumstance Butler was indebted for the clearness of his Church views. Keble felt strongly attracted by the earnest young clergyman, who on his part used his opportunity with ardent zeal, and cultivated a reverent but independent discipleship of Keble, which led him in every difficulty to consult his opinion, and to ask for a sympathy which was ever most wisely and most ungrudgingly bestowed.

Within a short time of his appointment to Wantage, the Vicar was recognized as a man of mark. A parish machinery was quickly organized, and a parish life set on foot, which has proved the model for hundreds of other parishes, and a conspicuous evidence of the power for good of our parochial system. Butler was a man of very strong individuality, stern to himself and perhaps to others, absolutely indifferent to popularity, bringing everything to the test of practice, impatient of compromise, thoroughly convinced of the soundness of his principles, and not always presenting them in the most persuasive manner, with a strongly combative nature, but withal full of tenderness, and of a singularly large heart. His activity was extraordinary, and continued almost unimpaired until his death. Not a learned man, nor exactly eminent in intellect, but yet original in the truest sense, he may almost be said to be the founder of our Religious Sisterhoods, perhaps the most important creation of the Oxford Movement. It is true that

the earliest instance of community life was that founded by Dr. Pusey at Park Village, Regent's Park, as early as 1845. But Butler introduced into his scheme of Sisterhoods a definite Church commission to engage in various departments of Church work. His first idea was that of an educational community, which he actually planted in Wantage in 1848. But the attraction of penitential work proved stronger, and its need even more urgent. In 1850, the Sisters of Wantage were transferred to this branch of Christian ministry, just a year after the other great Sisterhood of Clewer had been started for the same object. After many difficulties, and in the face of widespread prejudice, the work continued to increase, until at the time of his death, in 1893, the Wantage community was undertaking no less than thirty-four branches of the work; nine of a penitentiary character, thirteen educational, and eight parochial.

Next to his foundation of the Sisterhoods, Butler's chief title to the gratitude of the Church lies in his unrivalled power of training faithful men for her ministry. Rarely, if ever, has a comparatively small parish furnished so many clergymen eminent for success in the ministry and for holiness of life. His system was one of strict discipline, tempered by loyal trust. It has been said of him, that had he not been the most successful of Vicars, he might have been the most eminent of Head Masters. At any rate his colleagues, some of them men of greater gifts than himself, invariably submitted to his judgment, and when they left him, were, as a rule, fully resolved to carry out his system in their own spheres of work. The system that he impressed upon them was that of the original Tractarianism in all its stern thoroughness, just where it grated most upon the prejudices of English

Protestantism. In his own words, he was a Sacerdotalist. He regarded this as the essential difference between Churchmanship and Nonconformity. "Are you a Sacerdotalist or a Plymouth Brother?" he would say, jestingly, implying that there was no logical stopping-place between the two. With this principle went its counterpart, the Real Presence in the Sacrament external to the communicant. These two doctrines he taught unflinchingly, though well aware of their unpopularity. ✓

To Keble, preferment never came at all. To Butler it came comparatively late in life, and from a quarter wholly unexpected. In 1880, he was offered by Mr. Gladstone, whose political views he had uniformly opposed, a Canonry in Worcester Cathedral. Here he continued his services to the cause of Christian education by founding the Church High School for Girls. He was blamed for admitting a conscience clause in the sphere of higher education, while opposed to it in elementary schools. But the difference of conditions in the two sets of schools was the reason of his apparent inconsistency. Where parents have the right of withdrawing their children, the teacher is at liberty to give definite Church teaching; but where this is not the case, he is perpetually hampered by the fear of teaching what the parents would disapprove, and finds himself on the horns of a dilemma, untrue either to himself or to them. In 1885 he was transferred, again by Mr. Gladstone, to the Deanery of Lincoln, where he spent the last years of his life, in a position worthy of his merits, but evidently less congenial than that of a parish priest.

Butler differs from Hook in that he is entirely a product of the Oxford Movement, and, in my opinion, second to

none in the fidelity with which he represents its tendencies. No man could be more loyal to the Anglican ideal. Never, except once for a moment after the Gorham judgment, was his allegiance shaken ; and even then he never turned in the direction of Rome. English to the core, he stands forth as a practical witness for the power of our Church system to cope with all spiritual difficulties, and to triumphantly vindicate a place for unpopular aspects of her doctrine in English religious life.

The third, and by far the most striking example of the success of the Movement in the Church at large, is Samuel Wilberforce, son of the great philanthropist, Vicar of Brighstone and Alverstoke, Archdeacon of Surrey, Dean of Westminster, Bishop of Oxford and Winchester, perhaps the most brilliant Bishop that ever sat on the bench, and with all his faults, the most powerful preacher and speaker, the greatest ecclesiastical administrator, and most influential spiritual counsellor of the nineteenth century. Wilberforce enjoyed the inestimable advantage of a home sanctified by the purest graces of Evangelical religion, as well as the loftiest moral righteousness, brightened with an affection so ardent and tender as to unite all its inmates in a bond of love that the most bitter separations never for a moment impaired, decorated with talent of the highest order, surrounded by the noblest and most refined influences that a society strikingly rich in gifted men and women delighted to contribute to the inmates of a home honoured by Englishmen of every party and every shade of thought. Never, I imagine, was any young man sent forth to his work in life under circumstances more favourable to the fulfilment of every hope that a fond parent might indulge or a discerning friend encourage.

It is quite impossible in a cursory sketch to do more than just call your attention to the main features of his life's work as briefly as is compatible with clearness. In order, however, to understand it, I must pause to enquire what direct effect the Tractarian Movement had upon him. You are probably aware that his two brothers, Robert and Henry, both Oriel men, both gifted with very high ability, both Tractarian leaders, as well as his only daughter and her husband, seceded to the Church of Rome. His brother-in-law and bosom friend Manning, whom he had appointed Vicar of his own parish of Lavington, also left our Church. These successive trials were not merely the cause of the acutest personal sorrow, but they not unnaturally added to the suspicion with which a large section of the Church regarded his religious views, and undoubtedly made the course he had marked out for himself, already far from easy, exceptionally perplexing and difficult.

When Wilberforce came to Oriel, Pusey and Newman were both resident. There does not, however, appear to have been much intimacy between them. And Wilberforce's departure from Oxford, his early marriage, and immediate immersion in pastoral work, separated him from personal contact with the men who were leavening Oxford thought. Yet there can be no question that he was distinctly impressed though never fully identified with what I may call the Keble element in the Movement. His father's evangelicalism remained with him to the last as the fountain of his deepest spiritual life. But as a system he left it behind. As Vicar of an important Parish in the Isle of Wight at the age of twenty-five, he had already matured that decided high Anglican Churchmanship, tempered on

the one hand by evangelical pietism, on the other by a strong conviction of the connection of Church and State, which he first advocated as a preacher and writer, and subsequently enforced as a Bishop ; and which, containing as it did several complex elements, caused him to be often misunderstood, and sometimes involved him in conflicts with those who expected his unqualified support.

His extraordinary eloquence is known by report to all. Some of those present may, like myself, have had the privilege of listening to that matchless voice, and being carried out of themselves by the spell of that earnest, concentrated oratory, which seemed so conscious of its mastery over the intellect and will of the audience, and so convinced that that mastery was due, not to the talent of the speaker, but to the truth of his message.

But though he was widely known as the ablest of the younger ecclesiastics, and perhaps the most effective of all public speakers, it was not until he was made Bishop of Oxford in 1845 that his full powers came into play, and during the twenty-four years that he held that See they were maintained and developed with each succeeding call upon them with a concentrated and unresting activity that was nothing short of prodigious. It is no exaggeration to say that he revolutionized the English Episcopate. Appointed to what was then the most difficult of all the Sees, at the very moment of the crisis which lost Newman to the Church, he seized the first opportunity of taking action of so pronounced a character that skilled as he was in reading human nature he must have known it could not but entail very grave consequences.

Dr. Pusey had opened a correspondence with him on the state of the Church, and more than hinted that in his own

hands rested the power of retaining a large section of distressed minds in their allegiance. The Bishop, rightly or wrongly, understood Pusey's letter as an overture of alliance, covering something like a threat. He at once refused to enter into any negotiations, and gave Pusey to understand very clearly that he meant to rule the Diocese according to his own convictions, and in addition to this he expressed strong disapproval of the tendency of Pusey's teaching. Pusey enjoyed a very peculiar position at Christ Church. Within its precincts he was independent of his Bishop, and the Bishop was not one to attempt to exercise an authority he could not enforce. He was therefore unquestionably wise in declining a correspondence with one so difficult to persuade and so controversially expert as the great Doctor. But I think the Bishop's courage in taking so prompt and vigorous a stand is worthy of commendation. It was sure to make him liable to misconstruction, and to alienate many devout minds, while in no way conciliating the other side.

The Bishop's idea of his office was, like that of St. Cyprian, to overlook and direct every form of Church work in the diocese, to be the inspiring source of all enthusiasm, the real practical controller of the whole machine, knowing everything that was done, and making his approval or displeasure felt by every clergyman or lay official placed under his rule. His personal gifts fitted him admirably for the task. He hardly ever forgot a face he had once seen, and, what is more extraordinary, the name and the circumstances of first meeting were promptly recalled, so that people who had met him once at some large gathering were astounded to find years afterwards that he not only knew who they were, but almost always could bring back to their memory some

incident of the occasion proving the genuineness of his friendly greeting. Then again, such was the force of his spirit and such the charm of his manner that it was almost impossible to resist him. He had the rare power of not merely feigning, but actually feeling a heartfelt interest in the difficulties of his parish clergy, and whenever he saw a man really earnest in his work, he placed the whole force of his immense spiritual personality at that man's disposal, and so lifted him above his ordinary self that many of his clergy owed the whole success of their ministerial life to one interview with him. The devotion of his clergy to him was absolute. A minority of extreme Protestants of course disagreed with him. The Latitudinarians disliked him. But the vast majority feared, loved, and trusted him ; and whenever he wanted the backing of his diocese, he could almost always get it. The machinery of his government was the old-fashioned one of Archdeacons, Rural Deans, and Examining Chaplains. Only he took care that these offices should be no sinecures. He expected his officers to work as ungrudgingly as he worked himself, and they rose to his expectation. No diocese has surpassed, if any has ever equalled, that of Oxford during the years 1848-60. It at once set a standard to the English Church, to which we still do and probably shall always point. And the only reward the Bishop had to give was his favour. His patronage in the diocese when he came into it was ridiculously small, and although he increased it tenfold, through the confidence he succeeded in inspiring into patrons, yet to the last it remained but moderate, and never included more than one of the six canonries of Christ Church.

The two great features of Bishop Wilberforce's spiritual

administration were his Ordinations and his Confirmations. In both these his originality and earnestness made an epoch in the Church. Before his time Ordinations had been, as a rule, perfunctory and utterly unimpressive. The candidates lodged where they could, went through their papers of examination at the end of the week, met the Bishop at dinner once before the Sunday, received their titles, and departed immediately after the Ordination. The greatest spiritual opportunity in their lives was in nine cases out of ten missed. Bishop Wilberforce at once changed all this. He first made the examination a reality. To the astonishment and often to the anger of wealthy but lazy young men, he studied carefully the chaplain's report of the papers, and if it was unsatisfactory he refused to ordain them. In this matter he was inflexible. Just as he expected, in four or five years his Ordination candidates were the best prepared in the whole province. Here again he created a standard for the Church, which has not been allowed to drop. And then he wisely separated the intellectual preparation from the spiritual. The few days before the Ordination were entirely given up to spiritual addresses, devotions, and private interviews. The Bishop with his penetrating questions sifted each candidate's heart. Few indeed could bear the ordeal unmoved. To many it was the crisis of their life. The Bishop was never more powerful as a preacher, more august as a ruler of men, than when he sent forth labourers into the vineyard of the Lord.

His Confirmation Addresses, being more public and popular, were still more famous. In them he was at his very best. Those who accompanied him on a Confirmation tour were amazed at the energy which could deliver day after day

three most intensely earnest and moving addresses, followed by the manual labour of confirming hundreds of candidates, and every single address so completely independent that one clergyman says that out of fourteen in one week not a single sentence that he could remember was repeated twice.

I shall speak in my next lecture of those great revivals of Church life, the Diocesan Conferences, the Church Congress, and, above all, the Houses of Convocation, which were due to his initiation, perhaps, more than to any other single cause. They belong, indeed, less to the man than to the general life of the Church. But before I conclude this hurried and imperfect sketch of his activity, I must not omit that sphere of it which he always put in the forefront of all his public duties, namely, a regular attendance at the House of Lords. If he was the Bishop *par excellence* in his Diocese, he was the Prelate *par excellence* in Parliament. One Bishop, and one only, attained to greater influence, a man as different from him as one man can be from another, Archbishop Tait. Tait was not eloquent or versatile: he committed at least one fatal error. But he was a statesman of the highest calibre. And in this capacity Wilberforce must rank second, but only second to him. No one else can compare with him. Archbishop Magee was perhaps even more eloquent. But he was above all things an orator, whereas Wilberforce had from his youth been trained in the affairs of public life, and had the immense advantage of being the recognized mouthpiece of the entire High Church party, not in England only, but throughout the Empire. He almost directed the policy of the Colonial Church, such was the confidence reposed in him. And it was his persistency, adroitness, and persuasive power that made it possible to secure from Parlia-

ment the great and unexpected concession of the right of Convocation to debate.

He might well have aspired to an Archbishopric. No doubt he was deeply disappointed at being passed over both for Canterbury, on Longley's death, and for York on Musgrave's. It was expected that he would go to London, but his Church views stood in his light. He was finally translated to Winchester, the Diocese in which his beloved wife had died, and to which he was bound by so many old and precious spiritual ties. But the work of his life was done at Oxford, and in London in the great assemblies of the Church, and when his death came suddenly by an accident, in the sixty-seventh year of his age, it was felt that a man had passed away of the old heroic mould, who had crowded into forty-four unresting years of almost superhuman activity an amount of original work that had stamped itself for ever upon the Anglican Communion, and had left a name which would add new glory to that of his venerated father, and reflect the most imperishable lustre upon the Episcopate of England.

LECTURE V.

The Organization of the Anglican Communion.

IN this and the following lecture I propose to deal with some important features of the religious development of our day, which have arisen in connection with the Oxford Movement, though not in all cases directly traceable to it, but requiring a somewhat comprehensive survey of its influence in order to set them in their proper historical perspective.

I shall notice first of all those aspects of our Church's life which concern its organization, its outward mechanism, its capacity for action as a communion, not confined to these Islands, but co-extensive with the spread of the Anglo-Saxon race over the earth's surface. This will be the subject of the present lecture. In the next and concluding lecture I shall treat of the influence of the Oxford principles upon Divine Worship, of its effect on ceremonial and discipline.

It must be remembered that the keynote of Tractarianism was the Divine constitution and spiritual character of the Church. It drew a sharp distinction between the Church and the Establishment. It claimed for the Church the right of free action within her own lines. Its problem was, How are we

to enable her members to utilize their spiritual heritage?

Newman's solution of this problem was, in one word, to make them realize the Apostolic Succession, *i.e.*, to feel their unity with the Catholic Church of the ages, in and through the historic Episcopate. He held it as a first principle that the collective Episcopate, as representing the Apostolic College, chosen by Christ, is the one guarantee of continuity and the centre of organic life. But how is the Episcopate to reveal this life in action? Only by returning to the old constitutional methods, to those forms of assembly which have existed from the earliest ages, and, though for a time suffered to fall into practical abeyance, have never been wholly discontinued.

Quite early in the progress of the Movement an earnest desire arose for the revival of Synodical action in the Church of England, which is the one constitutional expression of her spiritual life.

As all here present are no doubt aware, the Church of England for many centuries possessed her own deliberative assembly, consisting of the two Houses of Convocation, in either Province, the Upper composed of all the Bishops, the Lower containing elected representatives of the inferior clergy. In order that a Church ordinance should have the force of ecclesiastical law, it was necessary that it should have been approved by the two Houses of Convocation, have been ratified by Act of Parliament, and have received the Royal assent. This was the basis of the Reformation settlement, the final stage of which was reached when the Act of Uniformity was passed (1661).

Since the year 1716, however, the power of deliberation had been withdrawn from Convocation by Act of Parliament.

The two Houses had been allowed to meet, year by year, simultaneously with the meeting of Parliament, but had been prorogued immediately after meeting, and had been refused permission to transact business. The formal machinery of corporate Church life still existed: but it had become a dead letter, a mere sham. The Church Parliament had lost its voice. There was no legal means by which the corporate sentiments of the Church could be expressed, far less by which, if expressed, they could be carried into effect. In plain words, our Church had no power of self-government. As far back as 1840 a Society was started for the revival of Convocation and the restoration of some at least of its ancient privileges. The originator and first president of this Society was Mr. Henry Hoare, whose efforts were ably seconded by Archdeacon Harrison, the pupil and friend of Pusey, Mr. Denison, afterwards Archdeacon of Taunton, and Bishop Wilberforce. For several years the Society contented itself with holding meetings, issuing pamphlets, and endeavouring in other ways to influence opinion within the Church. This was no easy matter. A strong body of prejudice existed not only among members of the legislature, and in still higher quarters, but also among the majority of the Bishops themselves, together with a large proportion of the clergy and laity of the Church. From time to time attempts were privately made to induce those Statesmen who were favourable to the idea to introduce a Bill, but none of them were successful.

It was the Gorham judgment that gave the opportunity for a more definite departure. That event had clearly revealed to many Churchmen, not only the unsatisfactory character of the Court of Final Appeal on doctrinal ques-

tions, but the impotence of the Church as a whole to make its voice heard. In the year 1851 petitions were presented to both Houses of Convocation by the clergy and laity of the Province of Canterbury that letters of business, as they were termed, might be sent by the Sovereign to the two Houses, empowering them to discuss general questions affecting the Church. Lord Redesdale undertook to present these petitions before the House of Lords. At the ensuing meeting of Convocation Bishop Wilberforce proposed that permission should be asked from the Crown to discuss the definite subject of a Clergy Discipline Bill. The Archbishop, however, refused to put the question, and prorogued the Houses. Shortly after this a change of Government took place, and the new Prime Minister, Lord Derby, expressed himself favourably disposed towards the action suggested. The result was that in November, 1852, Convocation met for the despatch of business for the first time for 135 years. An address to the Crown was drafted, and a Committee on Clergy Discipline that should report to Convocation was asked for and obtained. Considerable difficulties, however, still remained before the formal authorization to transact business could be obtained from the Crown. It was not until 1860 that this obstacle was finally surmounted. In that year a Royal Letter, authorizing the transaction of business, was issued: and since that date the two Houses of Convocation in either Province have met regularly as a Church Assembly for deliberation, passing resolutions, forming committees, and sending communications to Parliament. The Clerical Houses have been supplemented by a representative House of Laymen in each Province, who deliberate concurrently with their clerical

brethren, but have not yet acquired statutory authority. Eventually, no doubt, this authority will be obtained, and we may hope at no distant date to see a fully organized expression of the Church's mind, including both orders, constitutionally complete and formally sanctioned.

It is true the functions of Convocation are limited to deliberation. But when we remember that we owe to it the successful initiation of three great Church measures which have now become law, the Revised Lectionary, the Uniformity Amendment Act, and the Revised Version of the Scriptures, we must admit that a vast stride has been made towards the goal of united action, and that the revival of our Church Assembly has been one of the most important developments that have taken place in our day.

No doubt its usefulness is seriously hampered by two defects. The first, which has been already referred to, is its want of legislative power. The second is its unsatisfactory representation of the clergy. In the schemes of Ecclesiastical Reform advocated by the Church Reform League, and by Canon Gore and other eminent Churchmen, provision is made for the removal of both these hindrances. The proposal that measures for securing the greater efficiency of the Church, when passed by Convocation, should be allowed to be laid on the table of the House of Commons for a certain time, and, if unopposed, be entered on the Statute Book, is one of such provisions. And it does not seem beyond the range of possibility that if the spheres of Church and State could be subjected to Parliamentary revision by a friendly Government, sufficient freedom of action to satisfy High Churchmen could be obtained without sacrificing the principle of Establishment.

Next in importance to the revival of the Church's constitutional action at home is the extension of it throughout the Empire, and even beyond those limits, by the Colonial and Missionary Episcopate. To treat this subject at all fully would demand a separate lecture. Not only are the facts numerous and intricate, but the principles involved are extremely complex. All that I can attempt to do is to draw your attention to that aspect of the question which is specially illustrated by the principles of the Tractarian School. These principles, as I have more than once had occasion to remark, are as follows:—

1. The inherent right of the spiritual authority to determine all questions of doctrine, worship, and discipline in accordance with its own laws.

2. The necessity of Episcopacy to the existence of a Church, and not merely to its well-being, and, by consequence, the duty of sending out a Bishop in the first instance to organize the work of Christian ministration in a missionary district.

In the case of Crown colonies or our Indian dependency the Church enjoyed, and in some cases still enjoys, certain legal privileges similar to those which she enjoys at home. There was no question there about the Royal Supremacy being operative in exactly the same way as in England. But in the case of the self-governing colonies the case was different. In those cases where Parliament granted a constitution to a colony, the Royal Letters Patent under which Sees had been founded in such a colony lost their significance. This was tested in the case of Bishop Colenso. He had been consecrated in England under letters patent as Bishop of Natal, but subject to the Metropolitan rights of

the Bishop of Capetown, Dr. Gray, out of whose original Diocese that of Natal had been formed. Colenso fell into heresy, and was put upon his trial by the Provincial Synod of South Africa after the custom of the Primitive Church. He was found guilty, and deposed from his ecclesiastical rights as Bishop. The Court of Appeal at home, however, found that owing to the fact that the Cape was a self-governing colony the Crown had had no power to confer upon the Metropolitan any jurisdiction over his Suffragan. Therefore by English law Colenso, though he might be considered morally bound by his oath of allegiance to Capetown, and therefore without ground for resisting the deposition, was still legally Bishop of Natal, so far as his temporal rights in the See were concerned. Nothing daunted by this decision Bishop Gray determined, if Colenso should attempt to exercise Episcopal functions, to excommunicate him; and this he actually did, believing that the Bishops at home would support his action and consecrate another Bishop. It was found, however, that there were many difficulties in the way. And eventually, after a controversy extending over seven years, the consecration of Bishop Macrorie to the See of Maritzburg was performed in South Africa, and Colenso retained the empty title of Bishop of Natal until his death.

In this great conflict the two champions of opposing principles were the two ablest men in the English Church, Tait, Bishop of London, and Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. Tait was resolved to make the Royal Supremacy in ecclesiastical causes as much of a reality in the Colonial Churches as it was in our own. Wilberforce vindicated the right of a Colonial Church to independent spiritual action through its Provincial Synod, with an appeal in the last resort to Canter-

bury. In this resolve he was influenced more than he knew by the superior earnestness and strength of will of the Bishop of Capetown, and eventually he withdrew to some extent from the position with which he started, and withheld his full support from Bishop Gray's proposals.

The ultimate issue of the contest is very instructive. The principle contended for by Bishop Gray is evidently destined in the end to prevail. And this no one knew better than his great antagonist, Bishop Tait. But Tait's object was to allow the Colonial Churches time to organize themselves upon the lines of the English Communion before they should be compelled to approach the difficult task of independent self-government. And this object he achieved. At present the Churches of Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand are completely organized, and able to deal with such problems as that which confronted Bishop Gray without any conflict with the Queen's Supremacy or the Privy Council. Nevertheless, while the main principles of primitive Church government are fully established in each of our great daughter Churches, the links that bind them to the chair of St. Augustine are not broken, and the possibility of Synodical action by the entire Anglican Church is always kept in view.

Great as is the debt the English Communion owes to Bishop Tait for his unflinching courage and far-reaching statesmanship, the obligation it owes to those who, like Bishop Gray, represented the principles of the Oxford Movement, is equally important. Viewed in the light of history, the South African dispute was a test case of the first magnitude. It reveals the inestimable value of preserving to our Church the Royal appointment of its Bishops.

For it may safely be said that by no other means could men have been selected capable of such wide statesmanship and such tolerant justice: nor in my opinion would any other arrangement have availed to prevent that most disastrous result of a purely spiritual autocracy existing side by side with the secular power, and proceeding on principles often misunderstood by, and sometimes opposed to, the principles of secular justice. This danger, which from the experience of the Middle Ages cannot be called imaginary, is happily averted from the Anglican Communion, which, except so far as limited by the conditions of Establishment in this country and India, is wholly unfettered by the State, and yet has gained this freedom without any break in the continuity of its constitution.

A few words must be added on the extension of the Anglican Communion beyond the borders of the Empire. One of the most evident signs of its growing vitality is the establishment of Missionary Bishops consecrated at Canterbury to take charge of Dioceses of heathen inhabitants, or of congregations of English Church-people under foreign temporal jurisdiction. This is now a well established element in the Church's organization. Here again we owe a very real debt to the pioneers of the Oxford Movement, who emphasized from the first the necessity of sending out a Bishop as the rallying-point of Christian activity, and not leaving the mission work of the Church to be done by scattered clergymen acting under home committees which might prescribe methods of teaching narrower than those of the Church. By this agency, not merely have large districts of uncivilized Africa been placed under Episcopal supervision, but Bishops have been appointed in countries

of ancient civilization, such as China and Japan, which offer a most promising field for evangelical effort. The old State-aided Bishopric of Jerusalem has been replaced by a Bishopric in Jerusalem, with authority over Anglican congregations, endowed by voluntary contributions, in accordance with Catholic precedent.

We have thus briefly surveyed the extension of the Anglican Communion properly so called, *i.e.*, the Church of England, the Colonial Churches, which originally were parts of it, and which are now self-governing though still bound by their allegiance to the See of Canterbury, and those Missionary Bishoprics, or Churches, as they are now calling themselves, which have emanated from Canterbury, and continue to look to it as their centre of spiritual life and fountain of spiritual jurisdiction.

But there is a yet wider outlook. Not only is the Anglican Church as a whole thus conterminous with and even transcending the limits of the British dominion: but there are other great Churches wholly independent of it, which yet are proud to share in its communion, and to acknowledge it in some sense as their spiritual head. The Anglican Church proper has but one Liturgy, and one rule of discipline. These Churches have adopted Liturgies in some respects diverging from our Prayer Book, though in no way altering its doctrine, or varying from its liturgical spirit. Such are the Church of Ireland, disestablished about thirty years ago, and once united with our own: the Episcopal Church of Scotland, representing the ancient hierarchy, a voluntary body, with a large and flourishing Episcopate, and a wealthy, highly intelligent, steadily advancing laity: and last, but not least, the Protestant Episcopal Church of

the United States, with eighty resident and five Missionary Bishops, and over three and a half millions of adherents. All these bodies are in full communion with our own, and what is more, are evidently feeling their way towards some closer unity of organization. This tendency has found visible expression in those vast gatherings of Bishops every ten years at Lambeth, which are known by the name of the Pan-Anglican Conference, or, less accurately, the Pan-Anglican Synod, and are perhaps the most significant religious phenomenon of the day. But in order to understand their origin, and to appreciate the peculiar limitations under which they act, it is necessary to go back again to our own island, and to trace the various steps in home development which have made these great assemblies possible, and of which they are rightly regarded as the fruit and crown. The features of Church development, which we have hitherto considered, are what I may call the strictly constitutional movements of the Church, its organized life in the Houses of Convocation at home, and in the Colonial and Missionary Churches, and the constitutional relations of these with the Primatial See. Side by side with this Movement there has been going on another of scarcely less importance for ecclesiastical organization, and of even greater importance as a factor in the general religious life of the nation. I refer to the revival of the Diocesan organization of Rural Deaneries, which, after a long stagnation, has been aroused into vigorous life, and forms a most influential factor in the system of the Church. The Rural Dean, who has the supervision of a certain number of parishes under the Archdeacon, is an officer appointed as a rule by the Bishop, though in some cases elected by the clergy of his Deanery, but always acting

under the Bishop's authority. He is not only in minor matters the Bishop's channel of disciplinary communication with the clergy, but he has the power of calling together at least once a year the Chapter of Clergy within his area, as as well as a joint conference of clergy and laity for deliberation on subjects of importance suggested by the Bishop. The clergy are *ex-officio* members of the Chapter, the laity are elected by the Church members of each parish. From these various ruridecanal conferences are again elected clerical and lay members of the Diocesan Conference, which meets once a year for discussion and resolutions under the presidency of the Bishop. The constitution of these bodies varies slightly in the different Dioceses, but they all agree in the position they hold as representative gatherings of Churchmen, lay and clerical, for passing resolutions after discussion, and for appointing committees to assist the Bishop and Archdeacons in carrying on the business of the Diocese. From these conferences are elected delegates, lay and clerical, who meet once a year in London at a Central Council, whose president is a layman of high rank. At this Council subjects suitable for deliberation are suggested to the various Dioceses, and great Church movements organized or recommended. This Council also collects and tabulates the resolutions of all the Diocesan Conferences year by year, thus gathering together a varied body of general Church opinion, which is no doubt informal, but none the less valuable as a record.

These assemblies that I have mentioned, though including the laity, have a more or less distinctively clerical character. Their discussions do not attract much public notice, though their influence has probably been wider than is generally

supposed. But some forty years ago an effort was made to bring together Churchmen of all shades of opinion in a more public manner for purposes of discussion and reading of papers, after the manner of the great scientific and business associations, in order that the tendencies of thought and action within the Church might be clearly indicated to the nation at large, and that the Church itself might, as it were, become animated with a common consciousness, and speak with a living, though still informal, utterance. To Arch-deacon Emery, of Ely, more than to any other individual, must be assigned the credit of carrying this idea into realization, and bringing about what is by far the most popular embodiment of ecclesiastical discussion, the Church Congress.

The idea is of course not new. The present is an age of Congresses. In every department of art, letters and science it is found advantageous to collect together, either annually or at longer intervals, the most prominent exponents of each branch, in order to sum up in a comprehensive manner the progress that has been made, and to set before the public such new discoveries and suggestions as may claim its attention or support.

The Church Congress in some respects resembles these intellectual *réunions*, of which the British Association may be taken as the type. But it also has affinities with those great practical gatherings of the Democracy, such as the Trades Union Congress, the Co-operative Congress, and the Congress of Friendly Societies, which the genius of the working classes has so successfully established for the satisfaction of their own special needs.

Taking its stand upon the claim of the Established Church

to be the expression of the national Christianity, the Church Congress concerns itself not only or chiefly with resolving questions of Church organization and discipline, but still more with defining the attitude of the Church towards pressing questions of spiritual need at home and abroad, with popularizing her work, with familiarizing the working classes with her history, and showing her sympathy with those social difficulties which are the acutest problem of the age. The Congress is held annually, by invitation of one of the Bishops, in some prominent centre of industrial life, more rarely in one of the historic seats of Churchmanship. A Committee is appointed to make arrangements for choice of subjects and invitation of readers and speakers. The proceedings are inaugurated by special sermons preached by well-known divines or prelates; the opening address is always given by the presiding Bishop. The sessions consist of short papers read by experts on the different subjects, followed by one or two selected speakers, after which the discussion is thrown open to all the members. The object is to combine the greatest amount of instructed information with the greatest amount of free discussion. Neither of these can safely be neglected. Of the two I am of opinion that the second, as a safety-valve for grievances and misapprehensions, is on the whole the more important.

The tendency has been of late years towards a perhaps undue preponderance of elaborate papers and speeches by experts, which has had the effect of somewhat weakening the popular element. This tendency, if carried further, would be a subject of regret. For it is of the highest importance that the freest possible expression of lay opinion, even of lay prejudice, should be encouraged. In no other

way can misunderstandings be so well avoided and misconceptions cleared up. This is an age in which, while everybody reads widely, few read deeply. The mass of men and women prefer to form their opinions from short articles in magazines or reviews, or from oral lectures conveying well-digested information, or from the speeches and counter-speeches of able disputants advocating their rival views. So long as the Church Congress makes this its first object it is certain to retain its popularity, and to be a most powerful engine for influencing the public mind. There can be no doubt that of all the methods of Church organization in our time none has been so valuable in bringing people of opposite schools of thought together, of enabling them to enter into and appreciate views antagonistic to their own, and to realize how vast is the field of agreement in comparison with the points of difference.

Questions of doctrine, ritual, and discipline are wisely excluded from Congress deliberations. But it does not follow that great light is not thrown upon these subjects by incidental references, and still more by the personality of the great representative speakers. To take one example. The progress of Biblical criticism was for a long time regarded with deep suspicion by a very large section of the clergy and the faithful laity. But by the wise policy of the Congress Committees this thorny subject was allowed to be brought forward and popularly treated in open discussion. The result has been highly beneficial. Relief has been given to many anxious minds, and the exponents of critical science have been brought into direct touch, in a manner that would otherwise have been impossible, with the spiritual rights of the unscientific, and so have been taught the much-needed

lesson that sacred criticism requires reverent treatment, and that though the Bible *can* be treated as any other book it must not be so treated, if criticism aspires to guide within its own province the religious opinion of the English people.

I am afraid I have dwelt at too great length on this particular feature of our Church's life. And yet I hope that its importance will plead as my excuse for doing so. Though the Church Congress is in no sense a party organization, but as broad as the limits of our Communion, yet I do not think I am in error in regarding it as the legitimate outcome of that craving for organized expression which in its first clear pronouncement was due to the leaders of the Oxford Movement.

We are now in a position to return to that magnificent result of the Anglican revival to which I referred a short time ago, the Lambeth Conference, sometimes, but inaccurately, called the Pan-Anglican Synod, which is the seal of our spiritual unity and the earnest of a higher corporate organization to come.

The exciting cause of this development was the controversy in the South African Church. But the idea did not originate with Bishop Gray. It originated in the far West, in the year 1866, with the Metropolitan of Canada. This prelate, with the concurrence of his Episcopal brethren, sent a memorial to Archbishop Longley begging him to summon a Conference of Anglican Bishops. It was the opinion of the Canadian Episcopate that such a Conference would be the most effective mode of dealing with questions such as now convulsed the Church in South Africa. The Archbishop was at first unwilling to sanction the proposal, but after consulting with other Bishops, and more especially

with Bishop Tait, he was inclined to give it his countenance. Tait had already taken an independent line of action in the matter of Colenso by writing in his own name to all the Colonial Bishops, Archdeacons, and Deans, to ascertain their opinion on various questions affecting the relations between the Colonial Churches and the See of Canterbury.

The result was that on February 22nd, 1867, the Archbishop issued invitations to 144 Bishops, including those of the United States as well as of our own Church. Some few English Bishops for various reasons declined the invitation, and some were absent from illness. But when the time arrived a goodly proportion from all parts of the world appeared. No less than seventy-eight Bishops joined in the Conferences which took place from September 24th to 27th, on various matters affecting the Church's welfare. The burning question of the Natal Diocese was kept out of the discussion, greatly to the disappointment of Bishop Gray, who had come to England fully expecting to carry a resolution at the Conference repudiating Colenso's doctrines and endorsing his excommunication. The omission of this subject from the prospectuses issued seems at first sight to betoken indifference or timidity. But such was not in reality the case. As Archbishop Longley wrote to Bishop Wilberforce: "I cannot think it reasonable to write as though nothing had yet been done, as regards the Conference, in repudiation of Dr. Colenso, and its support of the judgment against him. No words can more significantly express the mind of the Conference than his absolute exclusion from it."

In the end Bishop Gray was induced to agree that the question should be referred to a committee, and to rest

satisfied with the resolution of sympathy passed by Convocation. The united utterance of the Conference took the form of an Allocution or Pastoral Letter, conspicuous for its moderate tone and its calm, dignified and affectionate spirit, which was mainly the work of Bishop Wilberforce, and is a good example of his statesman-like mind.

The precedent set on this occasion has been followed at the three subsequent Lambeth gatherings, the last of which, celebrating the 1300th anniversary of the planting of the English Church, is fresh in all our memories. In each case a Pastoral Letter, emanating from the entire body of Bishops, has been given to the members of the Church. As a rule, it has been thought well to avoid a definite pronouncement on questions where there is a deep-seated or violent divergence of opinion, and to concentrate on those topics which admit of a unanimous, or nearly unanimous, decision. In process of time, as the advantages of united action become more manifest and the need of it more keenly felt, the necessity for a more authoritative constitution of the assembly will also be rendered apparent. At present the utterances of the Bishops have no binding force. However, morally authoritative, they are not Synodical decrees, and cannot therefore be incorporated into the Church's law. A strong current of opinion is setting in towards the restoration of the Synod as the governing body of the Church. In the Synod not only the Bishops, but the clergy and laity are present. It is, emphatically, the assembly of the whole Church, not only of the governing portion of it. Even the most unqualified supporters of the power of the Episcopate to decide all Church questions admit the right and, indeed, the duty of the Bishops to summon to their assistance not only clergymen eminent for

piety or learning, but lay persons specially qualified to give advice. Until the revival of Synodical action is found to be possible, the Pan-Anglican Conferences, held every ten years, are a most valuable contribution towards the higher organization of the Anglican Church. No doubt it is true that other strains of influence, Imperial as well as spiritual, have had much to do with this important step forward. Yet it can hardly be denied that the first definite impulse towards it was due to the Oxford Movement. Among all the disciples of that Movement there is not one more genuine, more whole-hearted, more historically important, than Bishop Gray. And it is to his bold stand for the independence of his spiritual jurisdiction that we are indirectly indebted for the Pan-Anglican idea.

Hitherto we have considered the effects of the Movement, direct and indirect, within the limits of our own Communion. But they have also operated beyond those limits. From an early period in Tractarian history, the idea of reunion between the separated branches of the Catholic Church floated as a vision before the minds of its leaders. The sense of our isolation weighed heavily upon the spirits of Newman and Pusey. The former in his "Prophetical Office of the Church," and the latter in his carefully reasoned "Eirenicon," contemplated the possibility of healing the deadly wound of separation between us and the Roman Church as a legitimate object of prayer and of practical effort. The idea took shape in an Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom (A.P.U.C.), founded about 38 years ago, in which priests of the Anglican, Roman, and Eastern Churches agreed to use a certain form of intercession, and to meet occasionally for united consultation and prayer. An organ

called the *Reunion Magazine* was started, and the society increased its membership to a considerable figure. The association still exists, but attracts less public notice than formerly. The spread of its principles has been somewhat injuriously affected by the confusion of it in many minds with a very different organization, the Order of Corporate Reunion, which, so far as its aims are made public, certainly appears to work for the complete mutual recognition of the Anglican and Roman Churches. The basis of union suggested by this body would involve the recognition of Anglican Orders by the Roman See, and the acknowledgment of the Pope's primacy by the Anglican Church.

The attitude of the Vatican, however, has not been such as to encourage the slightest hope of a *rapprochement* on these lines. The celebrated letter of the Pope, addressed, not to the English Church, but to the English people; the attempt of Lord Halifax to obtain from the Vatican a fresh investigation as to the validity of our Orders with a view to their recognition; the Papal manifesto on the subject; the very able and exhaustive reply of the English Archbishops; and the attempt by Cardinal Vaughan to change the point at issue, are all fresh in our memories. It is obvious that the desire for reunion on equal terms is confined to one of the two parties, and meets with no response whatever from the other.

Foiled in this direction, the Catholic party in our Church has turned with better prospects of success towards the great Eastern Communion, which, in spite of some misconception of our position, has for several years evinced a most friendly attitude towards us, and is evidently inclined to go to considerable lengths in the direction of brotherly sympathy, if not to some closer connection still.

As you are well aware, the desire for reunion is not confined to one party in the Church. The Evangelical Section desire it too, but their advances are addressed to the Evangelical Churches of Continental Europe and the Free Churches (as they are styled) at home. As, however, these bodies regard the form of Church organization a matter of secondary importance, the reunion desired by them is rather that of joint action in religious enterprise and interchange of pulpit ministrations than any corporate solidarity. The Oxford School, on the other hand, holds the central principle of the Apostolic Succession. It cannot, therefore, be satisfied with its existing relations to the Historic Churches of East and West. It craves for visible unity, and, at the risk of misinterpretation, holds out its hand to them both. The issues of this development are yet in the womb of the future, and he would be a bold prophet who ventured to forecast them. Still, there can be no doubt that the great spiritual wave of reunion which swept across the religious mind of England so forcibly a few years ago, was to a large extent generated by the forces of the Oxford Movement.

I have now surveyed briefly and sketchily, but I hope not otherwise than clearly, the entire field of Anglican organization, and have endeavoured in a few words to point out the connection between the Movement which forms the subject of these lectures and the extraordinary, almost miraculous, extension of the Church's vital energy. Nor do I believe that my estimate is in any way exaggerated. If anything, I believe that posterity will credit the Oxford triumvirate and their School with an even larger share in this great ecclesiastical resurrection than I have assigned to them.

I shall conclude this lecture by noticing two other effects

of the Movement, one of which, though not at present a constituent feature of ecclesiastical organization, is not unlikely to become so, while the other is an adjunct to religion of great and enduring significance. I allude to the re-establishment among us of religious communities and to the revival of Gothic architecture.

Community life includes, of course, the monastic system as well as the conventual. It is founded upon the idea that the celibate life is the higher form of self-dedication to God. The celibate ideal had been for some centuries repugnant to Anglican traditions. The Reformation had left the question of clerical marriage to the conscience of the individual, but the words of the Ordinal and the overwhelming preponderance of public opinion distinctly implied its general desirability. Of late years two influences have conspired to modify this view. The first is the heightened conception of the mystery of the priesthood, emphasized by the first Tractarians, which has once more raised the idea of clerical celibacy to a position of spiritual attractiveness. The other is the fact that owing to the pressure of poverty at home and the demands of Mission work abroad, the marriage of a considerable proportion of the clergy has become practically impossible.

The ideal of the celibate life necessarily leads on to that of the religious community. The words, "It is not good for the man to be alone," remain, and will always remain, true. Several tentative steps have been taken to introduce lay brotherhoods, bound by temporary vows. Keble was the first to apply himself to the task, but without success. The idea exists, and has vitality, but it has not yet found an appropriate sphere of development. Within the priesthood community life has been brought to a more successful stage

of organization. Perhaps the best known of such communities is the Society of St. John, with its headquarters at Oxford, commonly called "the Cowley Fathers." These societies have taken root in our Church, and are doing a work which it seems hard to believe could be done by any other means. Everything points to a large extension of the principle in the near future. As a preliminary step, discussions are being held in Congresses and Conferences, in which the difficulties are pointed out and the prejudices which undoubtedly exist are endeavoured to be met. It is probable that if communities of celibate priests or lay brotherhoods are to enter on anything like their former scale into the corporate action of the Church, they will have to be arranged in accordance with the forms of modern life, and worked in subordination to Episcopal authority.

With sisterhoods the case stands on a somewhat different footing. Woman's work is, thank God, now fully recognized as an integral and most precious element of Christian ministration. At the same time it is certain that such work, if it is to be efficient, cannot be confined within the opportunities which family life affords. The Bishop's wife, the clergyman's wife and daughters, the wives and daughters of devoted lay Churchmen, the public-spirited single women who labour in many fields of spiritual work, the deaconesses, the Bible-women, nurses, district visitors and teachers of all kinds, are all provided with a recognized status in the field of Church life. But there is still a large and important class of ministrations that can only be efficiently performed by women set apart and trained by long spiritual discipline. The rise of sisterhoods in England is one of the most undoubted and most important effects of the Oxford Movement. To Pusey's

initiative it is almost entirely due. It was through contact with Pusey that Mr. Butler of Wantage, and Mr. Carter of Clewer, drew the strength of enthusiasm which enabled them to face the suspicion and unpopularity which met their first efforts. It was natural that a revival of Community discipline should provoke the hostility of the public. An institution which had been associated with the invasion of family life, had proved liable to grave abuse, and had been (so it was fondly believed) discarded for ever at the Reformation, was now reappearing in our midst, in humbler proportions it is true, but with the same ideals, the same methods, the same mysterious attractiveness as of old. In spite of all discouragement, the work grew. Its two objects, on the one hand dedication to a purely devotional life, on the other works of mercy among the sick, the outcast, and the fallen, possess an eternal attraction for the self-sacrifice of womanhood. And amid the complex elements of our modern life it was soon found that a place was open for this particular form of it, and within twenty years of the commencement of the Movement, the position of sisterhoods in our Church was recognized and secure. And from that time forward it has been steadily advancing, and will beyond doubt assume in the future still larger proportions.

When first the work was started in the Diocese of Oxford, it found a congenially-minded, though prudent champion in Bishop Wilberforce. In the Diocese of London, Bishop Tait was of course in far less sympathy with the movement. Yet so fully did he recognize its necessity as well as its value, that, contrary to the expectation of many of his friends, he accorded it his guarded, but powerful support. The main difficulty has always been the relation of the

Mother-Superior, and to a less extent of the Chaplain or Warden, to the Bishop. Where the Bishop is visitor and the Chaplain holds his license, there is a check upon the abuse of power. But where this is not the case, an *Imperium in Imperio* is in danger of being erected, which has not only disadvantages from a general point of view, but is calculated in the end to bring trouble to the Church. It is not only the difficulties that arise about life-long vows, or the disturbance of family harmony, but questions of property are also involved, which demand the most careful supervision by the authorities of the Church, if the system is to obtain undisputed recognition by the nation as one of the accepted branches of its Church's work.

The last point to which I would direct your attention to-day is the immense and far-reaching stimulus given to Church art, and especially to architecture, the grandest of all the arts. The enthusiasm for all that is mediæval, which was and still is a most remarkable sign of our time, is primarily due not to any directly religious impulse, but, more than anything else, to the genius of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and, above all, Sir Walter Scott. It was Scott's poetry and novels that awoke the slumbering imagination of England, and inspired the national mind with æsthetic ideals which have revolutionized taste and feeling, and after being developed in other directions by Ruskin and his disciples and the pre-Raphaelite School of Art, have reacted no less strongly upon the spiritual and religious tendencies of the age. Strictly speaking, the Oxford Movement was primitive and not mediæval in its aims, that is to say, so far as it was conscious of itself. But there lay within it a very strong mediæval bias from the first, which soon asserted

itself in the impulse given to the revival of Gothic architecture. To Pugin is due the first thorough-going display of this tendency. He was followed by Barry, who has left in the Houses of Parliament an imperishable witness of its grandeur. The genuinely artistic impulse at once allied itself with the religious element, and the two speedily became inseparable. The old pseudo-classical style was discredited, and the hosts of Churches that were erected, rebuilt, or repaired were all subject to the dominant passion for reproducing mediæval types. In a few cases the model was sought in the basilicas of Italy, rather than in the pure Gothic of Northern and Central Europe. But this exotic form has never made itself at home in England. Almost all the great names, Street, Scott, Burgess, Jackson, Butterfield, Pearson, have done their best work in the Gothic sphere. And though it is fair to admit that the genius displayed by most of them is of a secondary and imitative rather than of an original character, yet the results are such as any nation may regard with pride, and are even of higher than merely artistic interest because they spring from a genuinely devotional impulse.

I reserve for the final lecture the most conspicuous and obtrusive of all the effects of the Movement, that extraordinary revival of the externals of Divine worship, which is summed up in the much-abused word Ritualism, together with the doctrinal and disciplinary controversies that have centred around it. I shall endeavour to treat this thorny subject as impartially and luminously as I am able, and shall conclude by estimating the net results of the Movement upon the Anglican Church, upon other religious bodies, and upon the Church at large.

LECTURE VI.

The Influence of the Movement on Ceremonial and Discipline.

IT must not be forgotten that the Tractarian Movement was primarily doctrinal and controversial. As Newman declares in his *Apologia*, "Its object was to hurl back the aggressive force of the human intellect." True to its profession, it began the conflict with the weapons of learning and argument. The present Bishop of London, in an address to his clergy delivered this year, makes the remark that the distinctive basis of Anglicanism is sound learning. He does not imply that this is its only basis, but he holds that learning is the special bulwark of our branch of Christ's Church, as authority is of the Latin and orthodoxy of the Greek Church. If this criticism be just, as I believe it is, the Oxford Movement may take the benefit of it. Beyond question it rests upon learning, not derivative or second-hand learning, but the true learning of original research and laborious, accurate scholarship. This learning from the first went hand in hand with a systematic method of spiritual discipline which, though not obtruded on public attention, was inseparably joined with the Church principles advo-

cated, and was, in fact, indispensable to their vitality.

But a learned movement can never be a popular movement. To influence the people as a whole it must bring its principles into touch with their life. It must give them something of which they feel the need. It must enter into their conception of practical religion; in other words, it must assert itself in the domain of public worship.

The Church's worship recognizes two methods of speaking to the human spirit—firstly, preaching; secondly, the ceremonial of Divine Service, and especially Holy Communion. At the beginning of the Movement the readiest and most congenial means of teaching was through the pulpit. It is strange how little account is taken at the present day of the extraordinary effect of the first Tractarian sermons. A writer in the *Guardian* in February last rightly drew attention to this oversight. He claimed that the principles of the Movement in their original purity may be better studied in the published sermons of Keble, Pusey, Newman, Williams, and Manning than anywhere else. It may safely be affirmed that with the exception of F. D. Maurice no preacher in this century has had a profounder effect upon thoughtful minds than Newman. We possess the testimony of Mr. Gladstone that of all the preachers he had heard none equalled him in the power of inspiring conviction, in that impressiveness which arises from the sense of absolute reality. Not that he was eloquent. Oratory was wholly alien to his temperament. But he had the power of making his hearers feel the nearness of the spiritual world, and the awfulness of its demands upon them, as few have ever had. His sermons were continued, with rare breaks, for a period of fifteen years, during which hundreds of the

acutest intellects, the most chivalrous and earnest natures, the most high-bred and aspiring spirits among our rising men, drew from him their convictions of what their Church taught, and of what their Saviour expected them to be. Besides the original hearers, a very wide circle of general readers has been reached by the eight volumes of Parochial Sermons, of which successive editions have appeared, happily not forbidden by the changed conditions of their author's religious life.

Dr. Pusey's sermons have also obtained a tolerably wide circulation. In his case the difference between the spoken and written word would not, perhaps, be so keenly felt, for Pusey's manner and delivery were by no means popularly attractive. Yet, speaking for myself, I may say, never having heard Newman, that no preacher to whom I have listened has ever equalled Pusey in that peculiar power over the hearer's soul, which breaks down all resistance and makes it a willing recipient of the sternest, most uncompromising presentation of gospel truth. The same quality I apprehend to have belonged to both the Kebles, and to Manning also, though in his case, as in those of Church and Liddon, there was a strong infusion of oratorical art, which, however, did not at all detract from the impression of reality. It is necessary to insist on this point, because a widespread notion prevails that the Oxford Movement depends for its success on external ceremonial and is weak on the pulpit side, a notion which, in the earlier portion of its history at any rate, is quite erroneous. During the last twenty or thirty years it may be granted that preaching has not been its most effective instrument. But I cannot admit, even with this reservation, that it has neglected preaching,

or that the average of its preaching power is below the Anglican level either in argument or earnestness, though perhaps the scope of the sermons has been somewhat narrowed by a predominant reference to the claims of the Church.

But beyond question the popularizing of the Oxford Movement is due to the expression of its principles in public worship. The first care of the Tractarians was for reverence in the Divine Office. In point of ceremonial they made no innovations. The black gown was not discarded. The simple ritual until then in use, was adopted in all particulars. The only difference lay in the manner of rendering it. Even among reverent-minded men, a certain laxity had prevailed in the conduct of worship. The tone of voice in which the prayers were read, the mannerisms of the pulpit, the method of administering Holy Communion, were all such as failed to a great extent in what ought to be their first object, to make the officiating priest himself and all who join him in worship, realize that they are in God's presence, united in adoration of the Supreme Being, separated for the time from all worldly surroundings, from all merely human associations. This defect Keble set himself to remedy by concentrating every effort upon such a rendering of the whole service as should impress the minds of those present that they were offering a sacrifice to God. The desired impression was made. We know from the testimony of Isaac Williams that Keble's awestruck reverence in the House of God not only made an indelible mark upon his own religious ministrations, but subdued into reverence the proud and naturally rebellious spirit of Hurrell Froude. Through him it came to Newman, and, fastening upon a congenial element in Newman's soul which had never before been touched,

wrought itself into his very nature, and bore fruit in that strange, almost mysterious detachment of manner, which, while it quenched every sign of merely human emotion produced in those who saw it, the impression of a spirit in visible touch with the unseen. Newman's disciples seized upon the outward signs of their leader's conception of worship, even reproducing his abstracted look, his tone of voice, his gestures, his use of a small-sized Office Book. There soon arose a style of conducting the service which proclaimed the infusion of a new element, that of adoration, as distinct from edification; not that the former had been wholly absent, but that the latter had been made too predominant.

But thus far no tendency had been shown towards an advance in ritual. Questions of ritual could have had little interest for men like Keble, Newman, Froude, Williams, or even W. G. Ward. Pusey's attitude on this subject has been already stated, and there is no reason to think he ever departed from it. To him ritual was only valuable as the faithful expression in worship of a daily realization in practice of the mysteries which it symbolized. He did not approve of teaching through the senses spiritual truths to which the heart had not been converted.

It seems to me that this is an important distinction, if we desire to form a just judgment on the value of symbolism in worship. What is called a high ritual may be the spontaneous, the inevitable expression of doctrines firmly held and believed to lie at the root of Christian worship, so that those who hold them cannot without a sense of grievous loss dispense with their outward expression. This use of ritual, I take it, Pusey would have sympathized with and approved,

even though he himself did not feel the need of it. But the popular object of ritual is held to be not only the embodiment of truths already held, but the inculcation, through an easier medium than the intellect, of truths which must be taught to those who as yet have not reached them. It proceeds on the maxim of the great Roman poet—

"Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus."¹

"We must teach through the eye." Such is the oft-repeated precept. As I mentioned in a former lecture, the first of the Tractarian leaders to desire a revival of the disused vestments and the more elaborate ceremonial of the pre-Reformation Church was Herbert Oakley, minister of Margaret Street Chapel. I am not at all sure that he went as far as to regard high ritual as an instrument of teaching, but he certainly thought it a necessary accompaniment of intelligent and reverent worship. There can be no doubt that some changes were needed. The Bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield, one of the most practical and clear-headed of men, deemed it necessary to issue a pastoral to his clergy, enjoining the use of the surplice in the pulpit and the reading of the Prayer for the Church Militant wherever the Ante-Communion Service was held. Strange as it may seem, this order was received with genuine alarm by the whole Low Church party, clergy as well as laity, as tending in a Romeward direction. A well-known story is told of Bishop Wilberforce, on the occasion of the consecration of a Church in 1848, meeting a large number of his clergy, who were to

¹ "Things instilled through the ear are less powerful in impressing the mind than things that are brought before the faithful eyesight."—Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 180, 181.

walk in procession to the Church from the Vicarage. All but two were in surplices, as requested. These two appeared in the black gown, which they refused to discard. The Bishop, with that tact which never failed him, begged the two black-robed clerics to favour him by reading respectively the first and second lesson in the service. They could not decline so great a compliment, and at once exchanged the offending garment for one which brought them into conformity with the rest of their brethren. I mention these facts to show how strong was the prejudice fifty years ago against even that minimum of decoration prescribed by the undisputed law of the Church.

We must now consider briefly the development of Ritualism in connection with the Oxford Movement. Of course, it is impossible within the limits of a lecture like this to go at all fully into its history. This can easily be studied by such as desire it in such text books as the *Student's English Church History*, or other easily accessible works. All that is necessary for my purpose is to show that the Tractarian School, though not the authors of the Ritualistic movement, are unquestionably responsible for it. It follows necessarily from their principles. Their conception of the Church is essentially that of Latin Christianity, that of St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas Aquinas. The Church is conceived of as a supernatural body, existing independently of its members, represented by a Divinely-appointed hierarchy, who are entrusted by its Founder with the deposit of truth and the sacramental machinery of salvation. Its prime function is to save souls, to bring within its fold such of those outside as are willing to enter, and to provide the daily supply of grace for such as are already within it.

The first of these two functions is fulfilled by the Sacrament of Baptism, the second by that of the Holy Eucharist. It follows, therefore, that for the members of the Church the essential condition of growth in spiritual life is participation in the Sacrament of the Altar. The direct result of the Tractarian teaching is to concentrate all the elements of devotion upon the administration, or, in Catholic language, the celebration of this Holy Mystery, which is admitted by all to be the central act of Christian worship, the only service, properly so called, expressly commanded by our Lord. The problem set before them was how to bring this truth home to English Churchmen in a manner that none could mistake. Direct oral teaching was the first stage in the process. But obviously there were thousands of baptized Christians for whom this was not enough. To begin with, many absented themselves from the house of God, and could not be reached by sermons, still less by other methods of instruction. Then again, many were ignorant, unaccustomed to theological doctrine, or indisposed to receive it without criticism. For these the necessary arguments and exhortations were hardly suitable, or, if suitable for them, they would not edify the faithful who desired more advanced teaching. Evidently, the only effective means of gaining their attention was to make the service itself attractive to them, to draw them within the sphere of its influence, and to leave the impression to work. And this end could only be obtained by a vivid sensible presentation of spiritual truths, partly by music, but still more by an elaborate ceremonial, in which every detail should be carefully framed to symbolize a doctrinal fact. Such, I apprehend, is the origin of Eucharistic ritual wherever found. And Tractarianism, in its popular develop-

ment, is no exception to the rule. There was no hesitation about the duty of enforcing high Sacramental views. The only doubt that arose was, whether the formularies of the Church of England, construed according to the spirit as well as the letter, permitted the use of a ceremonial sufficient to achieve this end. As early as 1841, Oakley and others drew attention to the Ornaments Rubric, as capable of an interpretation favourable to the reintroduction of the ritual in use in the second year of Edward VI., which there was good reason to think, approximated far more closely to that of the unreformed Church than was popularly believed.

But it was not until several years after that the ritual question aroused public attention. Its emergence in what may be called the acute stage, is thus accounted for by the present Bishop of Winchester in his instructive *Life of Archbishop Tait*.¹ I will quote his words: "The famous Gorham judgment of 1850 had seemed to give a signal triumph to the Evangelical party. But in the reaction against that judgment the pendulum swung the other way. Old-fashioned Churchmen, who had no liking for the Oxford Tracts, were shocked at a sentence which seemed to them a flat contradiction of the plain language of the Prayer Book, and the result among High Churchmen was a wider tolerance for the vehemence, and even the vagaries, of men who now set themselves to emphasize, by outward act as well as spoken word, the Sacramental doctrines which had, as they thought, been unjustly assailed. With this encouragement there took place an advance in outward ritual, which had been discouraged as unnecessary or inexpedient by the early Tractarians, but which commended

¹ *Tait's Life*, Vol. I., p. 214.

itself to some among their followers as the necessary and logical outcome of what had gone before. Foremost among these 'Ritualists,' as they now began for the first time to be called, was the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. He was indefatigable as a preacher and a pastor, and the result of his appeals to a wealthy congregation was the erection of the District Church of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, which was consecrated by Bishop Blomfield on June 11th, 1850. Mr. Bennett's ritual in the Parish Church had been of so advanced a type as to call for several remonstrances from the Bishop, but St. Barnabas, it was evident, was to be the scene of much more development, and the storm began in earnest. It was the year of the 'Papal Aggression,' and when Lord John Russell, in his famous 'Durham Letter,' fanned the anti-Papal fury by denouncing the 'unworthy sons of the Church of England' who were 'forward in leading their flocks step by step to the very verge of the precipice,' he gave the signal for a clamorous outcry against Mr. Bennett, to whom he was known to be referring, and a series of disgraceful disturbances began. 'The Protestant cause' (says Bishop Blomfield's biographer) 'was taken up by those to whom all religions were equally indifferent, and all excuses for a riot equally acceptable, and every Sunday saw the Church doors besieged by a mob of disorderly supporters of the Reformation, and the services interrupted by their groans or hisses.' "

Such is the account given by one of the ablest, most moderate, and most statesmanlike of our Bishops. It points out what in the heat of controversy men are so apt to forget, that there is in ritualism something of a necessary

current of thought, something of a natural reaction. One cannot expect partisans on either side to realize this. But those who rule, whether in Church or State, will do well to take account of the laws which prevail in religious as in political development, and to mould their policy on larger lines than those of present expediency or present alarm.

The disgraceful scenes above described went on for some time, until Mr. Bennett, unwilling to cause his Bishop any further anxiety, resigned his living. He was immediately appointed to the Vicarage of Frome Selwood, where he became equally conspicuous, Mr. Liddell being appointed to St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, in his room. This gentleman carried out his predecessor's policy, and in due time was prosecuted under the Clergy Discipline Act for irregularities of ritual. Meanwhile a change had taken place in the See of London. Dr. Blomfield resigned, and Dr. Tait succeeded to a legacy of controversy which lasted not only during the whole period of his tenure of the See, but with only a few years of respite, to the day of his death. The ritual cases that obtained the greatest public notoriety were those of St. George's-in-the-East, the most troublesome and violent of all, in connection with which the name of Father Lowder, one of the saintliest of our Parish Clergy, comes into notice, and the still more famous name of Alexander Heriot Mackonochie first emerges into light. Then follow in succession the cases of Mr. Stuart, of St. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square; Mr. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, Holborn; Mr. Arthur Tooth, of St. James', Hatcham, and Mr. Pelham Dale, of St. Vedast's, all in the Diocese of London: those of Mr. Purchas and Mr. Wagner, in the Chichester

Diocese, that of Mr. Bennett, in Bath and Wells,¹ Mr. Enraght, in Worcester, and Mr. Green, of Miles Platting, near Manchester, the history of all which is doubtless familiar to every member of my audience.

It is not my purpose to attempt even the briefest summary of this prolonged, hotly contested, and still fiercely burning controversy. All I shall do will be to endeavour to disentangle the great principles involved, and to indicate as clearly as I am able to real point at issue.

The first thing that strikes a student of the Ritual Controversy is the strange misapprehension of its real import, which prevailed for many years among that large section of the laity, who were indifferent, or opposed to it, and also among many of the occupants of the Episcopal Bench. The attitude assumed by them was that of an impatient, I may say, contemptuous disapproval. Men of great influence in the Church spoke of the Ritual movement as if it were a kind of man-millinery, an eccentric personal taste for gorgeous habiliments, a frivolous and culpable insistence upon external ceremonies, which gratuitously scandalized the religious feelings of the average Churchman, and grievously injured the incomparably more serious and important duty of Christian charity and fellowship. To men trained in the older school of moderate or Evangelical Churchmanship, it was at first inconceivable that devoted and earnest parish priests should be willing to injure their own usefulness, and discredit the Church of their birth, by insisting upon things in themselves so absolutely indifferent as the colour of a vestment, the swinging of a censer, or the

¹ This was, strictly speaking, a case of disputed doctrine, though involving, of course, the corresponding ritual observances.

lighting of a candle. This was at first the frame of mind in which Bishop Tait approached the question. He was too just not to recognize in the most ample terms the self-sacrificing work of the men with whom he remonstrated: at the same time he could not understand why in matters of Ritual they should not accept his ruling, and shelter themselves, if they felt aggrieved, under his responsibility. It is true he moved far beyond this point of view, as years rolled on, and he became better acquainted with the inner significance of Ritualism. But undoubtedly, his want of sympathy for the Eucharistic views of those whom he opposed blinded him to their motives in resisting his pressure, and caused in his mind that conviction of their contumaciousness which led him to introduce the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, which the Prime Minister, Mr. Disraeli, in giving it his support, declared to be a Bill for putting down Ritualism.

The same thing is true of two other Bishops who became involved in Ritual prosecutions, Philpott of Worcester and Fraser of Manchester. The latter declared, with regard to Mr. Green, that he could not understand on what principle he declined to modify his ceremonial in obedience to the Bishop's request, and therefore refused to veto the prosecution under the Act, which led to the scandal of Mr. Green's imprisonment.

Now, whatever may be our individual attitude towards what are called excesses in Ritual, we shall, I suppose, all be ready to confess that the above explanation of them is entirely inadequate and superficial. The mere love of gorgeous ceremonial, of the sensuous accessories of worship, may have its place in securing the popularity of Ritualism. But it is not the root of it. It is an accidental feature which

commends it to numerous minds, and must not be confounded with its essence. The root and essence of Ritual is the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as the true oblation by the Priest of the real Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Altar under the species of Bread and Wine. So long as this doctrine was generally regarded as foreign to our Church, there could be no Ritual question. There might be certain survivals of mediæval ceremonial, as in some of the Cathedrals on great occasions, which, historically speaking, required for their interpretation a pre-Reformation view of the Eucharist. But these created no controversy, because they were accepted in an antiquarian spirit, for their historic associations, not as instruments of inculcating dogma. But the Eucharistic teaching of Newman and Pusey and their followers aimed at re-establishing in our Church a view of the Sacrament which would necessarily carry with it the re-establishment of pre-Reformation Ritual. No doubt Pusey was fully justified in claiming for those who thought with him the right to emphasize that sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion which has been vindicated by some of the greatest divines of our Church, and which is certainly never disowned by any of its formularies. And it is also true that he believed the way to do this most effectively was not by ritual but by oral teaching. Nevertheless, it is certain that Pusey's judgment on this point was at fault, and that the men who were occupied in grappling face to face with neglected populations and bringing them to what they held to be the Church's teaching, were better judges of the best means of doing this than he was. Men's minds have been moving fast in these days. And not only have their minds moved forward, but their character has

??
6

been profoundly modified by the spirit of the age. The Tractarians belonged to a man to the old, aristocratic *régime*. They believed in the teaching of the public by those whose attainments and character fitted them for teachers. They viewed with suspicion what we may call demonstrativeness in religion. Self-control and reserve were habitual to them. But the younger generation had grown up under the influence of democracy, which had inspired it with a different temper. In spiritual things as in political, the masses have become impatient of being taught by their superiors. What they learn they like to learn in their own way. And this is mainly through the eye and the outward sense. As in political matters, great ideas have to be brought home to them through great demonstrations and spectacular effects, so too in religion, it is by sensuous presentation far more than by oral instruction that religious impressions are made familiar. The Roman Catholic Church has always understood this element in human nature. The ceremonial of the Mass, by concentrating every point of Ritual upon the one central feature of adoration of the present Christ, has succeeded in attaching to itself a perfectly unique popular devotion. No Roman Catholic would dream of placing any other act of worship on the same level as that on which is wrought the great miracle of the Altar. Other services may have their special uses, their special attractiveness, but the Mass is the one central service, the Church's great tribute to God.

If, therefore, it be a legitimate object of endeavour to replace the service of Holy Communion in that central and unique position which the Mass occupies in the Roman Church, the obvious means of attaining this object must of necessity be employed. A ritual must be used approxi-

mating as nearly as local and national customs will permit to that which has been so successful in the Roman communion. It becomes, therefore, a matter of vital necessity to those who have this object before them, to be at liberty to avail themselves of the means of effecting it. So long ago as 1841 Oakley perceived this, and pleaded for the legality of the ornaments referred to in the well-known Ornaments Rubric. And it is around this Rubric that the controversy has been waged for nearly fifty years, and is still going on, with unabated vigour. The ostensible dispute has been concerned with chasubles, lighted candles, wafer-bread, incense, what are called the Six Points of Ritual: but the true subject of conflict is whether a doctrine of the Eucharist, undistinguishable, except for the dogma of Transubstantiation, from that of the Roman Church, may, or may not, be legitimately taught in the English Church. "The hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob."

If, therefore, the foregoing analysis be correct, the fundamental point at issue is not really one of Ritualism, but of doctrine. Is the sacrifice of the Mass, to give it its real name, a permissible view of the Holy Sacrament in the Church of England? Is it fairly to be reconciled with our Prayer Book or our great High Church Divines? Can it claim to be legitimately comprehended within the broad limits of our Communion? If it can, then the legalization of the ritual that symbolizes it must of necessity follow. It may not come at once, it may not come without a severe struggle, but it will have to come at last.

I do not know that I am called upon to pronounce one way or the other on this momentous question. To do so

would require far greater theological knowledge, far greater reliance on my own judgment, than I possess. Personally, I am quite unable to accept the Sacramental theory which I have now been characterizing. Personally, I shall feel the sincerest sorrow of heart if it succeeds in making good its claim to be the true teaching of the Anglican Church. I shall regard such a result as a disastrous step backward, as a return to a less spiritual form of religion, from which we believed we had for ever emerged.

At the same time, I wish to put before you as just and impartial a view as I am able of the contention of the extreme High Churchmen. It cannot be denied that a large body of admittedly-orthodox authority strongly upholds the doctrine of a Eucharistic sacrifice. As the Archbishop so clearly and temperately expressed it in his Visitation Charge, there is a very wide latitude of permissible opinion on this subject. Only two theories are expressly or virtually excluded, on the one hand, that of Zwingle, which regards the Eucharist as merely a commemorative rite, and on the other, that of Trent, which declares it to be a real propitiatory sacrifice for sin. The localization of the Divine Presence in the elements is not only not affirmed by our Church, but in one particular aspect of it is emphatically denied. But the Privy Council in the case of Mr. Bennett refused to condemn his teaching of an Objective Presence, thus admitting that there is a sense in which it may legitimately be held. At the same time, my own opinion strongly inclines to the view taken by Hooker, and by Keble in his first edition of the Christian Year, that the mind of the Church of England is most truly expressed by saying that the Body and Blood of the Lord are received in the heart by faith,

and not that they are received in the hands by manual delivery of the priest.

And I am persuaded that this is in substance the belief of a large majority of our Church people. So long as this belief is not superseded, so long as what many of us believe to be a materialistic view of the Real Presence is not attempted to be substituted for it, I do not think that a gradual increase of outward ceremonial will be greatly resented. In an age like this, when refinement and splendour are becoming general in all branches of our life, I do not think that religious people would disapprove even of splendid vestments or stately ceremonial, provided they were satisfied that these were not intended as a cover for introducing the Roman theory of the Mass. Here again, I set personal predilections on one side. For myself, what is called high Ritual has no attraction whatever. On the contrary, I dislike it, and infinitely prefer the unadorned impressiveness of the old-fashioned simple service. Yet I cannot but feel that this extreme simplicity, when contrasted with the rich musical adornments of Matins and Evensong, may be liable to be misunderstood by uninstructed persons, who measure the importance of a service by its external grandeur. How comes it, I have heard it said, that you affirm the Holy Eucharist to be the Church's greatest act of worship, when you bestow all your methods of attraction not upon it, but upon other services which you hold to be of lesser obligation, lesser solemnity? If, therefore, it be right to use every means of presenting the Holy Communion to our people as the central act of worship, is it wrong to surround it with at least equal splendour to that which is lavished upon Morning and Evening Prayer? It seems to

me only just to men who are placed in a difficult position, to put before you the considerations that must inevitably be present to their minds.

And this fact, I cannot help thinking, gives the key to what appears the very inconsistent attitude of the Tractarian School to the Church Courts. At first they hoped great things from them. So convinced was Pusey that his doctrine was the true teaching of the Church of England that he repeatedly challenged his opponents to submit the points in dispute to the Court. He desired to appeal to the Courts from the condemnation of his sermon by the six doctors, and was only dissuaded from his purpose by the extreme technical difficulty of getting the case heard. He desired to refer the questions between himself and his Bishop to legal decision, and offered to bear all the expenses of the proceeding, out of regard for the great advantage that would accrue to the Church if the points were once for all settled. Some years later, when the case of *Westerton v. Liddell* was decided by the Committee of the Privy Council, the judgment was on the whole very favourably received, and neither Mr. Liddell nor his advisers showed any disposition to disobey it. It was when the decisions of the Courts became less favourable, and more especially, after the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act, that the attitude of the advanced party underwent a change. This change was no doubt occasioned by what seemed to them the unsatisfactory character of the judgments: but it only brought clearly to light a principle which was inherent in the Movement from the first, and which was bound to assert itself sooner or later, viz., the incompetence of a temporal Court to define the sacramental teaching of the Church of Christ.

It is in this connection above all others that the English Church Union has assumed a leading part. This important organization, which numbers among its members several Bishops, over 6,000 clergy, and 24,000 laity, was started in 1860 to defend the doctrine and ceremonial of the Church of England against attacks from any quarter, and to assist with legal advice such clergymen as were involved in difficulties on account of adherence to what the Union believed to be the Church's law. From the first it expressed dissatisfaction with the existing Courts, as being deficient in spiritual authority. It objected altogether to State-made law being imposed upon the Church. It affirmed as a first principle that no Court is competent to decide a question of Church doctrine or discipline, except one that emanates from the Church itself in its spiritual aspect. The judge in the first instance is the Bishop, the appeal from him is to the Bishops of the province sitting in Synod, and the final appeal is to a Council of the Patriarchate, or ultimately of the entire Church. The function of the Civil Court is merely to see that justice has been done. The only appeal allowed to this Court would be that known as *tanquam ab abusu*, i.e., on the ground that it has not legitimately exercised its authority, and that therefore a new trial must be held. This has been explicitly laid down by a circular of the Union, which was known to emanate from its President, and must therefore be considered authoritative. On this point, it was asserted, no compromise is possible. The position was still further elucidated by the Rev. T. A. Lacey speaking at a great meeting of the English Church Union on March 7th, held at the Church House. After remarking that the recent action of the Union had swept away all side issues, and brought the

main issue clearly to the front, he is reported to have said : "The object for which they had taken the field was to maintain the independence of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Their independence of what, or of whom ? Their independence of any external authority whatever. The Courts of the Church of England were competent to deal with all spiritual matters, without dictation from any external authority, whether Pope or King. This was what they meant to fight for and win. It was for that cause they were accused of disloyalty. They claimed to be among the most law-abiding of the people of England. They were fighting for the independence of the Bishops' Courts. Was that disloyalty to the Bishops ? He thought they were more loyal to the Bishops than the Bishops were to themselves. It was the duty of the Crown to restrain civil persons from interfering in ecclesiastical matters."

The speaker here indicates what is unquestionably the logical outcome of the whole Oxford Movement. He is putting into a practical shape and bringing to a practical issue what Newman had laid down as a doctrinal principle, viz., that the Church is a spiritual body, existing by its own constitution, and governed by its own laws, unable to admit any jurisdiction in things spiritual at the hands of the secular power.

Stated in this extreme form, the position is incompatible with Establishment, as we have it in England. But neither did Newman, formerly, nor does the Church Union as a body now, profess to desire Disestablishment. It is evident, therefore, that some concession, short of logical consistency, is contemplated by the Union as a possible solution of the existing difficulty. There are two parties that must be

satisfied if the alliance between Church and State is to continue. There is the one, which insists upon the Supreme Court of Appeal in all questions being a lay tribunal. There is the other, which insists with equal emphasis on the right of the spiritual authority to decide the doctrine and ceremonial of the Church. Notice was given of a Bill to be brought before Parliament this session, for the amendment of the Law relating to the Ecclesiastical Courts, of which the main feature was the retention of a Committee of Privy Council as the Court of Final Appeal, but with a provision that in all cases where a question of doctrine was involved, an assembly of Bishops of both provinces should be consulted, and that their opinion should be considered by the Court before giving judgment, though not necessarily held to be decisive.¹

In the present tension of feeling, it is as well that any attempt at legislation should be postponed. In the first place, it is desirable that when it comes, it should be backed by the virtually unanimous support of the Church. In the second place, it is by no means certain to what extent a section of the clergy are disposed to refuse obedience to the rulings at present in force. The Bishops, who ought to know, are almost at one in declaring that the number of such clergy is extremely small.

Meanwhile, it is important that time should be given for estimating the result of the action of the two Archbishops, who have taken a new departure of the utmost possible significance. They have so far recognized the necessity of

¹ If this latter condition could be accepted, the Catholic party would probably be satisfied. It is not an ideal solution from their point of view, but it would give them substantially what they want. It does not, however, appear likely to be conceded.

satisfying the demand for purely spiritual jurisdiction as to offer a joint hearing of any disputed question of ritual, each acting as the other's assessor in his own province. This hearing, as they have been careful to explain, is not a Court of Law, not, strictly speaking, a Church Court. It has, however, the advantage of being an extension of a procedure already laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, and therefore unexceptionable in character in the eyes of all true Churchmen. The provision referred to in the Prayer Book is that to resolve all doubts as to the interpretation of the Rubric recourse shall be had to the Bishop of the Diocese, and that, if he is unable to decide, he shall refer the matter to the Archbishop, whose decision shall be final. It will thus be seen that by the Constitution of our Church each Archbishop, sitting as Metropolitan in his own Province, has the right, under certain conditions, of deciding the Church's Law. In the present instance, this right is claimed jointly by the two Archbishops as representing the entire Church of England, and it is difficult to see what objection can be made to its exercise. Their joint Session as heads of their respective Synods, whatever be the legal aspect of their decisions, is so undeniably a spiritual tribunal that no clergyman, consistently with loyalty to the Church, can well refuse to plead before it. And as a matter of fact, we observe with satisfaction that the President of the Church Union has advised its clerical members to do so. Already a hearing has been granted on the important questions of Incense, Lights, and Reservation, which have been fully argued both by counsel and by experts, though judgment has not yet been pronounced.

Whatever the decisions may be, we cannot but believe

that the clergy affected by them will, in spite of some individual utterances which have seemed to imply the contrary, loyally accept and obey them. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that lay persons who felt aggrieved by them, might not necessarily hold themselves precluded from prosecuting in similar cases, on the ground that the pronouncements did not emanate from a Court constituted by the law of the land.

For to the great mass of the nation, the first principle of duty, as they understand it, is obedience to the law, saving only where the law is contrary to the supreme duty of obedience to God. To the nation at large there can be no courts but the Queen's Courts, for the Sovereign is the fountain of justice, supreme in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil. I do not, therefore, see how the Archbishops' Tribunal can be accepted as a permanent settlement, though we may hope that its moral authority will be such as to induce both parties to acquiesce in its decisions.

With all respect to the conscientious convictions of the advanced party, I cannot but think they are in error in attributing to the Privy Council any claim to settle disputed points of doctrine, still less to make doctrine, as has been said of them. As I understand it, Christian doctrine can only be determined in one way, which is by the voice of the assembled Church sitting in Council or Synod, and guided in its decision by the Spirit of God. All that falls short of this is concerned with the correct interpretation of formularies, and demands not only theological but legal knowledge. No doubt the Court of Appeal, which tries such questions, should consist of Churchmen. And this is provided for in the Draft Bill which has been submitted to

Convocation in the present year. But granting this point, I do not believe that the laity will concede the legal interpretation of their religious formularies to a body of ecclesiastics. There is a letter of Dean Hook's, quoted in Mr. Walsh's (so-called) "Secret History of the Oxford Movement" (p. 347), which gives the view of an old-fashioned High Churchman on this point, which seems to me worth reproducing.

"I see no objection to the Committee of Privy Council being our Final Court of Appeal: they do not form a Synod, and here is the mistake so often made. In an ancient Synod the members were legislators as well as judges. If they decided that such or such a thing was contrary to law, they might say, 'The law is a bad one, therefore we will make a new law.' The Committee of Privy Council does nothing of the kind. I wish to obey the Law. You say that the law means one thing, I say that it means another—and who shall decide? It is a question not of opinion, but of fact; and who can deal with such a subject so well as lawyers? Who could be worse judges than ecclesiastics, who would endeavour to bend the law to their opinions? The old High Churchman was wont to say, 'I will do what the Church orders me to do.' I like (he might say) lights upon the altar: but if you dislike it, let us see what the law says. To ascertain that point, I go not to parsons but to lawyers, who are not to make the law, but to discuss what it was made by ecclesiastics."

I know the opinion has prevailed among many persons that the Committee of Privy Council have been guided in their decisions, not by considerations of strict evidence, but by considerations of expediency. But I can see no ground

whatever for this opinion. It is true their decisions have been hesitating, and sometimes inconsistent. But this is owing to the great complexity of the subject, and the continual discovery of fresh historical evidence. And it may safely be affirmed that no other body of judges, with a confessedly imperfect legal training, would be likely to arrive more nearly at the truth than the most learned and experienced members of the very profession whose business it is to interpret written formularies. I must now leave this subject and pass on to the last topic on which I shall touch, and that only in the briefest possible way, namely, the influence of the Oxford Movement on the practice of Confession.

And here I shall only say that the growth of Confession in our Church, though due in great measure to the teaching of Pusey and his followers, is also a spontaneous impulse of the human heart, which must be accounted for by larger and more permanent causes. The essential element in the Reformation was not ecclesiastical, but spiritual. The casting off of the Papal supremacy, was but the outward and visible sign of the inward grace of freedom of the conscience. Protestanism, if it means anything at all, means the right of the individual soul to carry its burden of sin straight to its Divine Redeemer, and to obtain direct from Him on repentance and confession the assurance of His free pardon. If this is taken from us, it matters little whether we acknowledge the Pope's supremacy, or that of the Bishop, or that of the Priest. Our Protestantism is gone for ever.

Now it cannot be denied that this doctrine is one that entails upon him who holds it a tremendous responsibility.

It is an ideal of religious life so lofty, so arduous, that our Church recognizes the impossibility of making it universal. She has never forbidden confession. To do so would be an outrage upon the human soul. It would be to make sad those whom God has not made sad. It would drive many a true penitent to despair.

But though our Church has not forbidden confession, she distinctly regards it as the exception, not the rule. As has been well said, she prescribes it as a medicine, not as a food. To insist upon it as of universal obligation, or even as a condition of the highest spiritual life, is directly contrary to the spirit of our Church. But if persons feel that without confession they cannot come to Communion, or obtain the sense of peace with God, what is the priest to do if they apply to him for it? This was Pusey's answer to those who taxed him with enjoining it. It may have been his teaching that first stirred up the craving for this relief: but when it arose, how could he refuse his aid? And the same argument applies to countless other cases. The tendency of modern life is to weaken the parental responsibility for religious teaching, and to leave it more and more in the hands of the priest. And where this is so, the encouragement of confession naturally follows. If the laity who dislike and fear the confessional, would only devote themselves, as their forefathers did, to the thorough training of their children in the principles of religion, the danger of the nation's moral fibre being weakened would be less than it is. While, therefore, we cannot acquit the Movement of a direct tendency to encourage confession, more particularly in connection with the Holy Sacrament, we must also confess that the relaxation of religious strictness, the desire for spiritual comfort,

and most of all, the weakening of the old family religion, have been powerful contributors to the wide-spread use of the confessional. Unfortunately, on this point more than any other, there is a cleavage visible between laity and clergy; not that a very large number of the clergy hear confessions, but that the average Protestant Churchman has such a complete horror of the system, that nothing would be so likely to harden him against all clerical influence whatsoever, as the thought that his wife and children might be led to transfer to the priest that moral trust which he believes God intended them to repose in him.

I have now concluded the task to which at your Vicar's invitation I applied myself. I have endeavoured from the standpoint of historical Churchmanship to place before you the main features in the progress of the most remarkable religious Movement of the century. I have striven to be as nearly impartial as I can, and often more than impartial, sympathetic. I have tried to do justice to the purity of aim, the saintliness of character, the loftiness of intellect, which characterized the leaders of the Movement. I have endeavoured to bring out the spiritual principles that underlay the edifice of Tractarian Churchmanship, and to follow them in their development first in the life of individuals, then on a grand scale in the Church at large. I have connected many of the greatest and most far-reaching elements in our Church's revived organization with the impulse that flowed from Oxford, and have implied that in my opinion they form a goodly heritage, full of value at the present, full of promise for the future. And I have also traced to the same original source other elements in the Church's life which are equally prolific of discord and

anxiety, elements which I believe to be alien from the spirit of our reformed Christianity and distasteful to the great majority of English Church people, but which are welded so firmly into the framework of advanced Church opinion that nothing short of an explosive force seems likely to dislodge them. The attention of the English people has not unnaturally been concentrated exclusively on these contentious points and diverted from the larger and more constructive work of the Oxford Movement to which I devoted my fifth lecture, and which an impartial judge must ever regard as its chief title to our gratitude. Mr. Walsh, in his widely-read book, entitled, "The Secret History of the Oxford Movement," brings a very serious indictment against the loyalty and good faith of its original promoters and their present followers and successors. I cannot say that his imputations are false, because he brings documentary evidence in support of nearly all of them. But I think he is open to the charge of taking a narrow and one-sided view of the Movement as a whole. As a writer in the *Times* justly remarked, he has confounded the incidental results and *sequelæ* of the Movement with the main stream of its history. His very title proclaims that his view is incomplete. There is not only a secret history of the Movement, but an open history too. And the open history is the more genuine, the more important, and the more beneficial to the Church. It is visible to England and to the world. It is a history of Churches built, re-built, beautified, and restored: of services multiplied in number, heightened in reverence, rendered attractive to ever-increasing congregations: of an Episcopate strengthened considerably in numbers, immeasurably in efficiency and vigour: of a parochial clergy devoted

on the whole with self-sacrificing zeal to the duties of their sacred office: of a people whose interest in religion and in their Church is intensified to a degree that may well astonish those who remember the apathy of fifty years ago: of an ecclesiastical organization instinct with ardent life, grappling hopefully with the most difficult problems of the age, fitting itself with extraordinary versatility to the new conditions of a democratic society: of a Church that can no longer be contemptuously called the Church of a class, but is becoming, and will become still more indubitably, the Church of the people. These are the true fruits of the Oxford Movement, and who can doubt that they are on the whole the fruits of the Spirit of God? I willingly allow that there are baser elements mixed with the pure ore of truth. I grant that some of the principles advocated by the Tractarian School have no genuine place within the reformed Church of England. These must be disentangled from the rest, and disavowed by loyal Churchmen. It is not fitting that a section, however devoted, should be allowed to drag the whole body of Churchmen along a path they disapprove. These latter should make their voice heard, and emphatically repudiate the extremists' lead. It is not to be conceived of for a moment that the laity of the Church of England will suffer themselves to be committed through the silence of the Clergy to a policy which they believe tends towards re-union with the Church of Rome, even though its advocates sincerely disclaim any such ulterior object.

All that the successors of the Tractarian School can justly claim is that their position shall be recognized as legitimate within our Church, provided that what they contend for can

be proved to be lawfully included within the limits of her comprehensiveness. This opportunity is now being given them in the fullest and freest manner. The rulers of the State as well as of the Church have shown themselves more than impartial towards a party, which, whatever its excesses, has set a splendid example of devotion to the cause of Christ and the salvation of souls. But it is clear that some line must be drawn. It is clear we cannot tolerate the Oxford tutor's boast that he could teach the whole cycle of Roman doctrine unmolested as a priest of the English Church. While, therefore, I strongly disapprove of the spirit of Mr. Walsh's book, and disagree with many of the inferences he draws from his facts, I am not without hope that its publication may be overruled for good: that it may act as a needed warning to those clergy who are recklessly advancing along a dangerous path, and by the very violence of its invective may induce the intolerant Protestant faction to pause and ask themselves whether such an attitude is justified, whether the cause of righteousness can be served by driving out of the Church men conspicuous for their love of Christ and souls.

If our Church is still to be the Church of the nation, she must learn to "bear and forbear." She must recognize the very wide diversities of theological opinion within her fold, and be prepared for these to express themselves with corresponding differences of ceremonial. There have existed since the Reformation three great tendencies of thought, which have never been able to sympathize with one another. Yet history proves that each of them corresponds to a very large and vital element in the national Christianity. It will be an irreparable disaster, if through the influence of panic

and the anti-Roman prejudice, a course of action should be adopted, which should expel from our Communion men and women who were at heart loyal to it. This error was committed once, when the Methodist movement was disowned by the Church. May a similar experience, though from opposite tendencies, not again be so unwisely used! Let us plead for patience, justice, charity. If these are forthcoming, I cannot doubt that the Divine Guardian of the Church will grant us a favourable issue out of our present distress, and in the end strengthen that great and venerable Institution, which more than any other is identified with the spiritual history and moral progress of our land.

•

Postscript.



SINCE the foregoing lectures were delivered, the anxiously awaited decision of the Archbishops on two out of the three questions submitted to them has been given to the world. The processional use of lights and the liturgical use of incense have been declared unlawful. It is not unlikely that a similar conclusion will be arrived at on the still more important question of Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.

The Archbishops have grounded their decision upon the Act of Uniformity of 1559, which provides that the ministers of the Church of England shall use the ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and no other. From the outset it was made apparent that they would be guided entirely by considerations of legal evidence. Their intention in granting the hearing was not to make new law, but to ascertain the existing law. In pronouncing judgment, they confined themselves to the strictly judicial function of interpreting a legal document. They took no account of expediency nor of what was ideally best. Their personal opinion, one cannot doubt, was in favour of the suitability of incense as an adjunct of public worship. But they found no warrant for it in the formularies of our Church, and so they decided against it.

Their action has on the whole been very favourably received. The majority of Church people are satisfied that sufficient evidence was produced to admit of a conclusive decision ; that it was sifted with the utmost thoroughness and weighed with complete impartiality. Nevertheless, there are signs that the dispute is very far from being laid to rest. In the first place, the *Church Times*, which is the organ of the advanced party, draws attention to the fact that the basis of the Archbishops' judgment is an Act of the Secular Legislature, neither previously prepared by the Church's Convocation nor afterwards ratified by it,¹ and therefore not binding upon the consciences of Churchmen. In the second place, Mr. Kensit, as the mouth-piece of aggressive Protestantism, declares that now the law has been laid down he shall expect the Bishops to enforce it in their several dioceses ; and that unless they do this, he shall continue his agitation with the object of stamping out all ceremonies declared to be illegal.

Both these pronouncements have an ominous ring. If the English Church Union should adopt the argument of the *Church Times*, which a considerable number of its members have declared themselves ready to do, there can be little doubt that Disestablishment will be brought not one but many steps nearer the possibility of accomplishment. If Mr. Kensit and his friends should be supported by public opinion in their persecuting policy, it seems more than likely that the extreme party will be driven out of the Church.

¹ This of course does not apply to the Act of Uniformity of 1661, which had the complete sanction of the Church as well as the State. As Canon Gore has pointed out, the Archbishops were careful to insist on the fact that this Act fulfils all the conditions necessary to bind the consciences of Churchmen.

If the view of the situation taken in the foregoing lectures be sound, both of these results would be disastrous in the highest degree, not only to the Church of England but to the Christianity of the nation.

I have all along proceeded on the assumption that the maintenance of the national Christianity is the ideal which the Church of England should keep steadily before her. As the organization which exists to compass this ideal, she is no longer co-extensive with the nation. And this is not her fault. The nation as such has unquestionably surrendered some important elements of historic Churchmanship which the Church has never ceased to teach. It no longer holds Episcopacy to be a divine institution. It no longer accepts the sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry. It no longer believes in the necessity of the doctrine of Sacramental life. These facts are undeniable. But on the other hand, the nation has never rejected its belief in the Divine Sonship of Christ. It has never repudiated its faith in His Person as the only channel of eternal salvation. It has never called in question any of the principles He laid down, or denied the universal efficacy of His life, death and example. This being so, it cannot be justly affirmed that the nation has repudiated the religion of Jesus Christ or cut itself adrift from His Church.

And, unless it should do these things, either through its representatives in Parliament or by a decisive turn of public opinion, the Church, which it has made the guardian of its faith and worship, will incur a grave responsibility if she takes the first step to sever her connection with those for whose sake she exists. Circumstances might easily be con-

ceived to arise, which might not only justify but oblige the Church to seek disestablishment and to court disendowment. She herself in such a case might be all the stronger and purer for the change. Her organic life might be richer : her witness for Christ might be more telling. She would certainly have nothing to dread which could interfere with her spiritual vitality. Poverty, unpopularity, tribulation, would be more than balanced by increased devotion, patience and unworldliness. But she ought to be very sure that God was calling on her to make this experiment before she took the first step to bring it about. For it would be equivalent to disowning the nation as an Apostate from the faith of Christ. It would be surrendering not only the privilege, but the obligation which now lies upon her of bringing the Gospel message to every household that will receive it throughout the land. To justify so vast a surrender, she would require a very clear indication of the Divine Will.

But, still, it might come. Perhaps (who knows?) it may come sooner than many think. But I cannot myself believe that it has come yet. And, therefore, I hope the Church will not allow herself to be prematurely committed by one of her parties to the disastrous policy of obtaining present relief by resigning duties which she might still retain to the advantage of those who look to her for guidance.

And here, I think, we touch on the weak spot in the Oxford Movement. I do not allude to such men as Keble, or Pusey, or Butler, who were strong in patience, the most necessary of all virtues to the religious reformer : but to those who like Froude, Newman, Ward and Manning, demanded all that the logic of their convictions required,

and, still more, to many later representatives of the Oxford School, who have accepted the principles of these eminent men without their previous training.

The disciples of the Movement have been too much occupied in asserting the rights of the Church. They have done splendid service in setting forth these rights, both as against the State and as against the individual. And yet Luther's profound saying that we may leave God Almighty to take care of His Church, may have a special meaning for these days as it had for his own. The highest right of the Church, after all, must be to bear witness for her Lord. And this, for all we know, may often best be done in ways incomprehensible to us, and only fully recognizable after the events.

That the Church has indefeasible rights to some measure of self-government is certain. That some of those rights are infringed or curtailed under our present system is almost undeniable. That such curtailment is not unavoidable is evident from the case of Scotland. Therefore the desire of High Churchmen for greater freedom of self-government is both natural and just. Nevertheless, it may be the highest wisdom, the finest loyalty, to refrain from insisting upon its being granted.

For, as more than one of our leaders has reminded us, the withdrawal of establishment might mean disruption, and the only resulting liberty might be that of two or more separate bodies being left free to organize themselves on the basis of rival claimants to be the Church of the Nation. And then, who would be the gainer?

But if we deprecate any hastening of disestablishment from the side of the Catholic party, we disapprove no less

of the bigoted attempt to eject that party from the Church by a tyrannical employment of the Act of Uniformity. It is utterly futile in an age so full of life and creative energy as this, to attempt to bind more tightly the trammels which a policy proved impotent by the event fastened three centuries ago round the activities of the Church. To insist on regarding the Prayer Book as a complete expression of the mind of our Church is to falsify the experience of every day we live. A Book that provides no office for Missions, that does not recognize our Spiritual relations to our Colonial Empire, that does not explicitly allude to the Queen's executive government, that never hints at the possibility of reunion with the Eastern Church, can hardly be said to be an ideal manual for the present day. If there is one thing more certain than another, it is that spiritual forces cannot be held in check by material. The theory that coercion is no remedy has been accepted in a sphere far less unfavourable to its truth than that of religious zeal. It is hard to believe that those who advocate it can really expect it to achieve its proposed object. What it may and probably will achieve is to drive those who are subjected to it into self-imposed banishment, and perhaps to seek a refuge in the arms of another communion. If this is the result contemplated by Mr. Kensit and his friends, we do not congratulate the Church or the nation.

For our own part, we are sure that those who hurry it on are no true friends of the Church of England, no safe guides for religious men to follow. A Church dethroned and persecuted might well remain as the nation's better angel, pleading, not without avail, for its misguided charge. But a Church that consented to limit its spiritual energy by the

hard and fast regulations of a State department has already sold its birthright and must forfeit its claim to be a guide of souls.

This is an age of extreme statement in all matters of controversy. All parties profess to believe in the Catholic Church. Only the word Catholic contains two different and in the last resort incompatible elements, that of universality and that of organic unity. The Oxford School have taken their stand upon the latter element. To them Catholicity means external continuity through Episcopal succession, as the guarantee for unbroken tradition of the faith. It is therefore necessarily exclusive. To the other party Catholicity suggests inclusion, not exclusion. It makes for union, not of organization, not even of doctrine, but of spirit, of effort, of moral and social ideals, limited only by loyalty to the supreme claim of Christ.

This is the problem that the Churches in the coming century will have to meet. I do not say to solve, for the day of its solution is not yet. But the Church of Christ is ideally the whole human race, coextensive with that nature which He took upon Him and redeemed. And Christians can set before them no lower goal. How this goal is to be reached, we know not. The present seems dark and perplexing, and it is hard to see light. But we refuse to believe that a nation which, with all its faults, has never lost hold of the sheet-anchor of faith in Christ, will under the influence of temporary panic, either prove false to its cherished ideal of religious liberty, or deliberately allow sectarian partisanship to usurp its name and authority for the discouragement of true religion.

If the considerations that I have brought forward in this

little book should prove helpful, in however slight a degree, towards appeasing wrath and promoting a calm judgment on the issues of our present controversy, I shall be doubly grateful to those friends without whose kindly presence it would not have been given to the world.

THE END.



14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below,
or on the date to which renewed. Renewals only:
Tel. No. 642-3405

Renewals may be made 4 days prior to date due.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

FEB 8 1972 08

MAR 8 1972

REC'D LD FEB 13 12-2 PM 69

JUN 2 1973 63

REC'D LD JUN 4 73-10 AM 26

DEC 8 1983 44

DEC. CIR. NOV 22 '83

LD21A-40m-8,'71
(P6572s10)476-A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

